



Fontwell Avenue,
Eastergate,
West Sussex.
PO203RU
14.02.18

Dear Sir,

We wish to object to planning application AL/136/17/PL for the reasons listed below:-

1. **It is a departure from the Development Plan for this area.** The area of the Five Villages has many new estates currently under development. Indeed, a development of nearly 300 houses has just been given permission not 200 yards away. It would seem that there will be many hundreds of new houses available shortly. Although this proposal is outside of the Development Plan, past experience suggests that the Council will pass this application anyway, notwithstanding the complications related to Planning manipulation and road safety considerations which will also need to be overlooked. There is no point in the application being classified as, 'Outside the Development Plan' if there is always going to be an exception. When is the Council actually going to refuse to allow a development which is not part of the Development Plan?
2. Planning Application AL/136/17/PL was based on Planning Application AL/95/13/14 which was granted on 1st February 2014. This planning permission, which was given for 3 detached houses with garages for 3 years, **was not used** and has now expired. Therefore, there is technically **no prior residential approval in place on the site of this proposed development.** Will the Council again feel obliged to make yet another exception to its own policy and allow this much larger application on the grounds of a prior application which has already expired? Why make a time period at all if it means nothing?
3. Planning Application AL/136/17/PL seeks approval for 2 properties because the other two plots have been given approval for 2 properties.

This approval of planning on the other two parts of the field should not be considered a precedent for this remaining one. The applicants have simply manipulated the rules by applying in three separate applications, which provide a lesson to all would be future developers in, **'How to hoodwink the Council'**.

4. It is quite clear that there is a limit to how many properties are considered suitable for a particular space. The total area of the whole field is listed in the Officers Report as 0.6 of a hectare and the desired density level of residences as 11 per hectare. This is your own recommendation! **Simple mathematics dictates that for this part of the field, when the wastage of space to the front of the building line is taken into consideration, a total of six properties on the field is an overdevelopment.** However, this simple calculation seems to be completely disregarded and overlooked by everyone.
5. Application AL/136/17/PL based on AL/121/16/PL based on Application AL/121/16 which was itself based on application AL/95/13/14 gave **outline planning for 3 detached houses with garages. The removal of garages from future planning applications (including this one) has adverse implications for parking and road safety.** It is also out of character with the other properties found on Fontwell Avenue which all have garages or at least rear access.

The units on this site are calculated to require three parking spaces. The six units (when this application is passed) will require eighteen cars to be parked at the front of the properties. – In essence – a car park! The units already agreed and those proposed, have no garages and no rear access. Therefore, any visiting cars will need to park in the access road. It will become a ghetto, which will restricted free access to ambulances, fire engines and the like, **especially if the road carries traffic moving and parking in both directions.**

6. The size of the units in this application suggest that more than three drivers may reside in each unit -a much larger number than considered in the original application for three detached houses on the site. Each subsequent application has increased the number of cars entering and

exiting the site and thus increased the possibility of accidents especially as the new access road is sited adjacent to the original established **private road** and not shared, as listed in the last Council Report.

When the Council considered the three latest Planning Applications, they sought a response from WSCC Highways Department. The WSCC Strategic Planning Consultation reply stated,

'This application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Protocol for small scale proposals which include up to 5 residential units accessed from roads that do not form part of the Strategic Road Network.(SRN.)'

This application has brought the number of properties to six, clearly negating the desk top study. This application provides a 'way round the problem', which of course the Council will have to agree to – another access at the other end of the field. - Another object lesson in **'How to hoodwink the Council'**.

If granted, this extra access will simply re-create the access where it was originally, before the present owners moved it without permission to obtain planning in the first place.

Adding another access point will not ensure that cars entering and exiting the site, do so from the designated entrance. A second entrance would also mean the turning area previously agreed for the end of the access road would not be possible. Another blatant manipulation of the Planning System.

7. The Council have also already acknowledged the difficulty of accessing the A29 at this point in their refusal to previous Planning Applications (AL/122/87). This difficulty of access has only increased over time since nothing has ever been done to decrease the amount of traffic using the A29, and when the Nyton Road Development begins, (Less than 200 yards along the A29 and also exiting onto the A29) traffic will increase again. The owners of the site have already changed the access agreed in Application AL/

It is not positioned correctly according to the planning permission already given and is much wider than the one shown on the plan. They have in fact

created a layby on the A29. This issue has been reported to the Council Compliance Department who, although they have visited the site, measured the access and photographed its position, seem unable or unwilling to do anything about it! This road was laid well before Christmas and I still await a reply to my complaint.

Consequently, many lost H.G.V. vehicles travelling on the A29, pull into the access (parking across ours), when they are unable to find the address they are looking for. This is also the case for the general public when they wish to answer mobile phones. This has caused further problems with vehicles pulling onto the site in the dark, and getting stuck in the mud, because even after a whole year of complaints the site is not properly screened or secure. HGV's have sometimes been forced to back out on to the A29.

In summary then, we would like to object to Planning Application AL/136/17/PL because,

1. It would be a departure from the Development Plan. - The Council have already given permission for hundreds of houses in this vicinity and are not obliged to permit any more, even though we know that they will.
2. There is technically no prior residential permission in existence. - It expired in March 2017. It should therefore be easier to resist this application, although we know that this will not happen.
3. No precedent has been set by permission being given on the other plots – save that of planning rules manipulation.
4. The density of development on the site would far exceed the recommendation for the 'semi-rural area,' - the basis on which we pay our rates, a calculation which seems to be overlooked and ignored.
5. The size of the units requires a much larger allocation of parking/visiting spaces. A house with four bedrooms in a 'semi-rural area' will obviously at some time have more than three drivers.
6. The Highways Department Small Scale Development Study would be invalidated and the extra access road, another example of planning manipulation, would not ensure that vehicles entered and exited the access road in the correct direction. It would also take up the turning space already reserved by previous applications.
7. The owners of the site have already demonstrated that they will not comply with planning specification as they have already installed the access incorrectly and have not observed the considerate, yet

necessary, practise of screening the site from the road or from ourselves.

We are under no illusions, that the decision to approve this planning application will be made by the Planning Department and that the Planning Development Committee will be expected to ratify it. Past experience has shown this to be the case. The Planning Department answer to no-one and dictate decisions. However, for reasons of road safety and in order to avoid overdevelopment and its associated difficulties, we ask for 'common sense' to prevail.

Yours Sincerely

David and Susan Smith.