

Fairways,
Fontwell Avenue,
Eastergate,
West Sussex.
PO203RU
27.7.17

Dear Sir,

I would like to object to Planning Application AL/72/17/PL because I am very concerned amount the increase in the number of cars which will be entering and exiting the A29 at this point.

The access road to my house serves four properties. Thus, eight adults may be pulling on to, or off of, Fontwell Avenue at this point. When turning right, it is very difficult to see on-coming traffic because of the bend.

Since planning permission was given for two houses on the field and the owner has started living in a mobile home on the site, there has been a significant road safety issue. Cars have been parking on the grass verge outside of the field, on land belonging to the Authority. This has made pulling out on to the main road much more difficult as it is impossible to see on-coming traffic, usually travelling at speed. This problem has become so bad in recent months, that despite requests not to do so, to the people concerned, and complaints to the Council, the police have had to be called on several occasions. This problem could increase, if further planning permission is given.

As well as this inconsiderate parking, I am also concerned about the number of vehicles which might now be using the proposed access road to the new development. This proposed access road, which will run across the width of the field, will give access to many more houses than the one which already exists in the opposite direction. The

likelihood of an accident is therefore much greater if the number of cars entering and exiting the Avenue is increased.

I find it difficult to understand how permission could have been given in the first place for two roads to join the A29 at the same point, being immediately adjacent to each other and serving multiple properties. I can find no other place on Fontwell Avenue where this happens. If I were to exit turning right, at the same time as a car from the other service road was turning left, an accident would be inevitable.

For reasons of road safety, I urge you to reject this and future planning applications which will increase the total number of dwellings on the field.

Yours Sincerely,

Anthony Marriner.

Westfield House,
Fontwell Avenue,
Eastergate,
West Sussex.
PO203RU
2.8.17

Dear Sir,

We wish to object to planning application AL/72/17/PL for the reasons listed below:-

1. It is a departure from the Development Plan for this area.
2. It is based on application AL/95/13/14 which was granted, on condition that a fee of more than £6000 in lieu of low cost housing, was paid to the Council. This fee is not recorded as being paid, (since it is no longer required by Government), the planning given for 3 years was not used and has now expired. Therefore, there is no prior approval in place on the site of the proposed development.
3. Application AL/95/13/14 seeks approval because the plot next door has been given approval. This approval (AL/121/16/PL) is the subject of a formal complaint and is currently under review by the Ombudsman. Depending on the outcome of his decision, it may well proceed to Judicial Review. It should therefore not be considered a safe precedent.
4. Application AL/121/16/PL was itself based on application AL/95/13/14 which gave outline planning for 3 detached houses with garages. The removal of garages from future 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.
5. The occupant of plot 1 (AL/121/16/PL) currently keeps 4 cars on site. The approval given under this application only allows for 2 parking spaces for each unit. An increase in the number of units granted planning

In conclusion, I would like to point out, that it is **implicit** in the rejection report by Mr. Sheen, that as the 5 units then proposed, would be an overdevelopment of the field as a whole, because of the small gaps between the houses, it is possible that 4 might be considered. However, we would point out that planning is currently in place for 2 units and this new application requests 2 more, thus making 4 units across **two-thirds** of the field. This is the same overdevelopment which has already been rejected, as the units are virtually on the same footprint, the only difference being that they have been applied for separately under two different planning applications. These different multiple applications, were first made by the same person, and are now being made individually by the three joint owners. It is expected that if this application should be given approval, an application will eventually be made by the third owner on the last third of the field thus taking the total count back to that, which has already been rejected.

Whilst we are aware that the planning department are unable to take into consideration the possibility of any future planning applications which may be made, we are also aware that should an applicant be able to show that a piece of land is unsuitable for any other purpose, on appeal of a decision to refuse planning, the Council are obliged to give permission. This would ensure approval for 5 or 6 units in all when the third owner submits an application on the last third of the field.

Planning Application AL/72/17/PL must therefore be rejected.

Yours.Sincerely,

David and Susan Smith.

