

Sandra Edwards

From: Daniel Vick
Sent: 09 April 2018 09:02
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application AL/123/17 - corrected email

Please upload to this reference.

Dan

From: Elaine Sturgess [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2018 16:34
To: Daniel Vick
Subject: Planning Application AL/123/17 - corrected email

Dear Mr Vick, (**this has been re-sent because it was sent in error and required some corrections and I did not include my full address on the 1st email**)

Re Planning Application AL/123/17- (Mildmay, Hook Lane)

I am writing to OBJECT to this application which I understand is due to come before the Planning Control Committee on 11th April 2018.

I also understand that only a few members of the Planning Control Committee took the opportunity to visit the site and that an observer is of the opinion that the officers were going to recommend the application.

Being a resident of Hook Lane I am very concerned about the change of decision which is being proposed. The new application is very similar, only slightly tweaked to AL/ 83/17/PL which was refused by your council only a few months ago because the proposed development was inconsistent with both the Arun policy Gen 7 and Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Plan policies H1 and EH8. How can this position be reversed despite the planning application only being the subject of a minor amendment?

NB. The new structure is totally out of keeping with the rest of the lane. There is not one flat roof in the entire lane and this new house proposal will stick out like a sore thumb.

NOTE. This application is also inconsistent with the approach adopted under application AL/118/17/HH which is another property close by called Northfields. The application was for a significantly less intrusive development than the one proposed at Mildmay. In relation to that application the Officer commented in refusing it that "the flat roof two storey extension creates an obtrusive and dominant feature which is harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area and the host property. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies DEV 19 of 2003 Arun plan and H1 of the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Plan the NPPF".

I understand that less weight might be attributed to the Neighbourhood Plan re housing numbers, but this application has nothing to do with housing numbers. I also do not believe that this justifies jettisoning the entire NDPlan which took several years of my life and others, to help get it organised & written. We were untrained members of the public and devoted many hundreds of hours to it. We were unpaid & untrained for the job & also spent considerable amounts of tax payers money to employ experts. My business and health suffered as a result of all this effort which I considered worthwhile enough to make the sacrifices demanded at the time.. and so too were some of the other volunteers.. If this application goes through the trust of a neighbourhood re the impartiality of Arun DC and the Planning system will be decimated.

If it appears there is an inconsistent application of both Arun's policy and those in the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Plan how can there be any faith in the Planning process.

As an interested resident I need to have faith that the planning policy is being applied in a consistent fashion otherwise there is little point in having such policies.

Please refuse this Application AL/123/17 so that community faith in the Planning process will not be lost forever.

Please acknowledge receipt of this CORRECTED email and confirm that it will be placed before the Development Control Committee.

Please also ensure that my address which is at the bottom of this letter and email address are redacted when this email is placed on the public file.

Yours sincerely,

Elaine Sturgess

