

scan

Fontwell Avenue,
Eastergate,
West Sussex.
PO203RU
18.06.18

Dear Sir,

We wish to object to planning application AL/ 50/18/PL which requests variance of Condition 10 imposed on planning application AL/121/16/PL. This is to allow the applicant to live in the house before the access is completed. We do so for the reasons listed below:-

1. The Applicant states in his application that he has completed the access road to the site, as required. This is not the case.
 - (i) The access is too wide. Mrs. Dannatt has already made two site visits and measured this.
 - (ii) The road has been constructed in the wrong place on the land. A buffer/landscape feature, has been omitted and for part of the site, the road runs adjacent to the boundary, instead of about 3m away from it. Mrs. Dannatt has already made a site visit and observed this. There is also a covenant on the land which does not allow this.
 - (iii) The road has not been constructed with the materials specified on the planning documents. Instead, large pieces of demolition waste have been used. You have photographs to show this and it is present and visible on the site.
2. The Applicant does not yet have a house to live in so this application is far too premature. Although he has been living in a mobile home on the site, since last June (2017), in order to supervise the build, he has so far, not completed the footings up to damp proof course.
 - (i) What footings have been constructed, have not been done so without properly joining wet to dry concrete, (you have photographs of this,) and are not the correct height above the ground.
 - (ii) The site location data provided by the applicant shows the land at a level of 13.1 (OAD). Condition 3 of his planning application requires that finished floor levels should be set no lower than 13.5m AOD. Thus they

should be at least 40cm above the level of the land. This is clearly not the case. Mrs. Dannatt has already made a site visit and observed this.

(iii) We have requested that the distance of the footings from our house be measured by yourselves, in order to reassure us that they have been put in the correct place. Mrs. Dannatt has already made a site visit and observed this but has not yet reassured us.

3. If a variation of Condition 3 of this planning permission were granted, Conditions 4 10 11 and 12 would also have to be varied because they could not be implemented before the applicant is permitted to occupy the house. Application AL/122/17/PL would also have to have many conditions varied and this application particularly stipulates that building must not even begin until the access and internal road have been finished properly.
4. The site is does not yet have mains water.
5. At the present time barriers have been erected along the boundary of the A29. Weeds are growing on them and restricting the view of oncoming traffic when WE USE OUR ACCESS. Condition 11 restricts such barriers to 0.6m high in order for safe access to be achieved by everyone. They are therefore too high and should not be allowed because of the covenant on the land. Although they have been accepted by the Council, 'no breach of planning at this time has been detected'), it is unreasonable to accept that WE should be subjected to additional danger when using our own access road for any longer than is necessary. Judging by what has already happened in the last year, the Applicant could live in his house, (when built) for a very long time, before finally completing the access and internal road properly.

We believe, that if this request were granted, the access to the development and the internal road, would never be properly finished. It is the case that the applicant has not observed any of the conventions of common decency associated with a building site in a residential area and in fact twelve Enforcement Notices have already been served on the owners of the land for, noise, pollution and working unsociable hours. The owners of the site do not seem to understand that anything constructed,

must be to the specification, size and location of the plans already agreed in the Planning Permission given. If the applicant is allowed to live in his house (which he does not yet have) before the front of the development is finished, we believe that further requests for variance will be submitted and when granted, will allow the second phase of building to begin, whilst the access and the internal road, remain the 'eyesore' they are now.

We urge you to refuse this Application.

Yours Sincerely,

David and Susan Smith.

