

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#)



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 July 2020 08:27
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: AB/49/20/L Objection

Please treat as a rep

Anita Gardner
Principal Planning Officer,
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737529
E: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



Sent: 20 July 2020 11:14
To: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: AB/49/20/L Objection

Dear Mr Wood,

Further to my objection, I note that the new application AB/75/20/PL confirms in the proposed floor plan (attached) the 2nd entrance to flat 55B via the new entrance in the communal area of 55A that was already created without permission the week beginning 25th May 2020. The entrance is currently being used by both the applicant of AB/49/20/L and Paul Meredith. Additionally, note that if entrance 1 to 55B is blocked, then Digby Fine Wines (who is a licenced for alcohol) would no longer have fire escape access.

Further, I am concerned of the continuing false statements being made in applications related to this building:

- 1) At the time AB/49/20/L was filed, the new entrance via 55A had already been created, but not mentioned in this application.
- 2) In AB/75/20/PL "No" is ticked in box 2 which is false.
- 3) In both applications AB/75/20/PL and AB76/20/PL section 4, it states works began 20/6/2020, this is also false.

Please advise whether these have been highlighted in your validation procedures and what action(s) will be taken against the applicants in both cases.

Kind regards
Mr Simon Birch

Sent: 09 July 2020 17:35
To: 'Andrew Wood' <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Juan Baeza' <Juan.Baeza@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: AB/49/20/L Objection

Dear Mr Wood,

Flat 55B already has an entrance through 55-57 High Street, that entrance has previously been maintained with the applicant's third party commercial lessee and as freeholder is the applicant's legal right to maintain as an entrance. There is no obligation in any approval that this entrance through the commercial part of 55-57 would in fact be closed off either temporarily or permanently.

More importantly, the applicant (as the sole director of the freeholding company) has been complicit in the creation of a new entrance at 55A High Street (the same building), where works began the week of 25th May 2020 with no planning applications visible. This entrance allows an alternative residential access to Flat 55B. Indeed the current address of the residential flat is **55B**. Any future owner of 55B will always require access at basement level of 55A (that can only be accessed through 55A) because the boiler and associated plumbing is located there. I understand as yet it is undetermined whether this new entrance at 55A is approved, or whether it has caused structural damage to the property. Additionally the legality of the works remains an outstanding issue.

Therefore, until these issues are fully determined, it would be unwise to approve a **THIRD** entrance to flat 55B in the communal area at 57A **where the fabric of the building would be further compromised**. I also note that the oval staircase in the communal area at 57 is specifically mentioned in the listing <https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1247998>, any **unnecessary** new entrance would detract from this feature. Therefore the application should be rejected or in the very least the decision delayed until the status of the works at 55A is determined.

Structural Engineers Report by Philip Goacher Associates


It is stated in their report that it is “conservatively assumed” that “the internal wall , where the new opening is proposed, is continuous from the ground floor up to the roof level.” **This assumption is incorrect.** The wall has already been knocked through at the first and second floors. Further, the structural engineer did not even attempt to notify me of his visit or make an appointment with me to view my flat or the flat above and has disregarded the works and issues that have occurred in the communal area of 55A (the same building). As a result, I have asked for a copy of their insurances but they have refused to provide these to me.

Breaches of Planning Law

It is recorded in writing by the applicant that they intended to complete these works illegally before planning permission was granted giving little or no notice to under lease holders. The listing of this building includes many specific items on the first floor (that are inside my flat), that could be damaged as a result of the vibrations of these works where timely before and after condition reports and specific insurances would be a necessity. After the applicant’s attempt was frustrated, it is also recorded that they have attempted to request special permission directly from the planning department. The applicant has committed 2 clear statutory offences in a previous application AB/49/17/L as well as breaching a key condition of the approval of that decision. It is unclear why statutory enforcement action has not been initiated yet.

Commercial Use

The owner of the freehold is in fact the company Green Gate London Limited which currently is holding a large lorry load of stock in the basement of this property (evidence can be provided on request). The entrance at 57A is for residential use, narrow and restricted by brickwork outside the door, absolutely unsuitable for frequent deliveries and exports of goods requiring pallets. It also should be noted that previously the entrance 55-57 was used to allow scaffolders to erect scaffold at the rear of the property at 57a from basement level to first floor level (I personally paid for these works in October 2017 and can provide proof of the same) so this application is again **unnecessary** to allow contractors access to the rear of the property and not a valid reason or excuse for the negligent lack of repairs to the rear elevation of the property.



Proposed Ground Floor Plan

