

Janice James

From: Julie Grieves on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 02 August 2012 14:16
To: Janice James
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application AL/72/12

Julie Grieves - (Working days Monday, Thursday & Friday)

| Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning and Building Control, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

Baeza

Sent: 02 August 2012 11:01
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application AL/72/12

Can this please be registered as complete letter of rep.

thanks

Juan Baeza | Team Leader - Planning Appeals, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Ian Lissamore
Sent: 02 August 2012 10:56
To: Juan Baeza
Subject: Re: Objection to planning application AL/72/12

Dear Mr Baeza,

I omitted to say that I have an interest in this application because I own Norton Dairy, which is attached to Easter Cottage the property adjacent to the stables which are the subject of this application.

On Thu, Aug 2, 2012 at 12:35 AM, Ian Lissamore wrote:

Dear Mr Baeza,

Please register my objection to the above application.

When the site was first approved there were three dwellings and two stores.

The developer was then permitted to omit the requirement for a cycle store on the original permission. No consultation was undertaken about this with existing owners, and as a consequence, we have bicycles, mowers and bins with no storage.

The site is supposedly strictly controlled under its planning regime, and yet the developer has already been permitted to convert East Barn from a store to a holiday let, and the building has two infringements to its planning consent, neither of which are likely to be corrected.. After making an illegal conversion of the stables, he now seeks to gain further financial advantage by applying for a further holiday let to a building that was also designated a store.

This building lies at the end of a single track width road access, with a communal turning space which will be lost if the development is permitted, there is insufficient space for additional cars to access this place, without causing obstructions and confusion.

03/08/2012

The loss of amenities to the two properties adjoining the stables is clear, and they were purchased in the knowledge that they were the only ones permitted in that part of the site.

The car-port shown would again compromise access, and alter the visual aspect of the cul-de-sack to its detriment. If permitted it would call into question the limitation placed on the other properties, which have been allowed no cover or storage for bikes, cars or log stores.

Since the conversion of the stables has been done illegally, the property has not been the subject of building regulation approval, and the blocking in, of what were originally stable doors, has been achieved in such a sub-standard way, that the building cannot be compliant with current insulation standards.

No doubt this application will be permitted, to the detriment of the other properties on this site. By so doing the planning committee will be condoning the illegal conversion of this building, and be guilty of showing support for a developer who has a long record of disregard for the planning processes, leaving behind him a mess which others have no option but to live with.

Ian Lissamore