

From: Mike Turner [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 April 2018 16:04
To: Daniel Vick
Subject: Planning Appl AL/123/17 - Mildmay

Dear Mr Vick,

In relation to the above Planning Application AL/123/17, - Mildmay, it appears that there could be a problem in the way that the Council is determining Planning Applications in Hook Lane.

I have already sent in a couple of objections to the above Application. As a resident of Hook Lane and also living very close to the Mildmay site, I again state that I do not object to a rebuild or major extension as long as the final result is in keeping with the character and appearance of the rest of the houses in Hook Lane. Although there is variation in the design of houses, there are none that have such an intrusive and totally different character to the Application AL/123/17. It has a flat roof with a slight slope as well as strongly overhanging a smaller ground floor. As a previous Planning Officer once commented about the original application, - **“that it would be much more suited to a coastal or woodland location”**, - which I would agree with. The appearance is extremely dominant and would stick out in Hook Lane like the proverbial “sore thumb”. It would also take a large amount of Southern light from the adjacent property due to the overbearing nature of the design.

He also said that :- **Application AL/123/17 goes against the Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan (ANDP) Policies H1 and EH8 and Arun Policy Gen 7.**

With regard to the problem that I referred to at start of the email, I have the following observation:-

With Application AL/118/17/HH which was only for an extension, the Planning Officer **refused it** on the grounds that it would be **“harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area”** and that it was **“an obtrusive and dominant feature”**. He also said that it was against ANDP Policy H1 and also against Arun’s existing Dev 19.

How is it, then that the Planning Officer for AL/123/17 is recommending the development, when this proposal is obviously far more dominant and out of character with the area than AL/118/17/HH, which was refused ?

There appears to a major inconsistency with the way that the Planning rules are being interpreted in relation to Hook Lane.

I therefore ask that you ensure that the Planning rules are applied consistently by the Officers in relation to Hook Lane.

I also request that, in view of AL/123/17 contravening the ANDP and Arun Policies mentioned above that you refuse this Application.

Please would you confirm receipt of this email and please make sure that it is presented to the Dev Control Committee and that they are made aware of my points about maintaining consistency.

Also, would you please ensure that my address and email details are blocked out (redacted) when this appears in the public record.

Yours faithfully,

M. Turner

Laburnums
Hook Lane
Aldingbourne
W. Sussex

P.S.. Please ensure that the address and email are redacted before publishing.