

JK

5, Countisbury Close,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
West Sussex.

11/11/2011

OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION ALDWICK: AS/269/11.

Dear Sir,

I sent my objection letter over a week ago but did not receive the usual acknowledgement letter from you. As I don't know if lost in the post or on route. Please find a second copy of my letter of objection to the above re-development planning application.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. W. Edwards.

ACK

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
29 NOV 2011
RECEIVED

5, Countisbury Close,
Aldwick,
Bognor Regis,
West Sussex.

11/11/2011

OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION ALDWICK: AS/269/11.

Dear Sir,

Please find my letter of objection to the above re-development planning application.

As I mentioned in my objection to the previous application. This application for a re-development takes us right back to the early 1990s when for about 12 years the then owner tried to get planning permission for a dwelling on this narrow plot of land. Two flats was scaled down to a single house, and finally to a bungalow. At all levels of planning the Parish Council, Arun District Council and the appeals to the relevant Government Environmental Dept all rejected every planning application put forward. Which meant 1, 2, or even 3 applications per year were being made and where another application was going in before a previous decision was announced? The re-submitted plans covered all the possible variations and alterations to the 3 types of dwellings (Location on plot, Georgian, non-Georgian, and chalet styles) but were still not approved as being acceptable.

Having exhausted all the possible combinations an application was presented for a pair of garages. Eventually permission was given for these two garages for residential use at the back of the plot to reduce the affect upon my adjacent property, and other neighbouring properties. I did request the chance of purchasing the plot through this period to keep it as an open space garden. But the owner although he discussed it several times, did not seem keen to sell the plot to me.

In fact the last planning application was for a chalet bungalow, set back in the plot as this application and a similar style but smaller structure to this application, but this was previously turned down by the local Planning Dept. and the Government Dept. on appeal. As there have been no changes in circumstances then there is no reason why this application should now be approved. If approval given now, I would want an inquiry into why a previously rejected application is now approved.

A chalet style property would not be in keeping with the rest of Countisbury Close properties that are all Georgian style houses, and would stick out like a sore thumb. There would be no benefit to the environmental or to the other occupants in the Close with this type of development, and is as with the previous owner strictly a speculative application.

I therefore ask that once and for all this application is rejected as with all the previous other dwelling planning applications to show further re-development applications will be rejected where no circumstances have significantly changed. The only change being the application is now submitted by a Development Company rather than individual. Not a reason for approving previously rejected planning application now and in the future. Also stop future applications that have already been rejected being re-submitted to save wasting everybody's time and council money that could be best served on other local services.

Being the owner of the property adjacent to this plot then any development will have an impact upon it. Although other properties will also be affected if such a planning application was to be approved.

As no circumstances have changed then I request that the planning officials once again review and reject any planning application for a dwelling of any kind on this narrow plot. Based on the results of at least a dozen previous applications, including a chalet bungalow to the rear of the plot similar to this application has already been rejected, the precedent was set by all the relevant planning authorities including the Government appeal system not to allow any dwelling development on this plot and other objects raised in the rest of this letter.

I still hope to someday acquire the plot and turn it back into a garden, a use that it was originally created for and to keep open the last open space in the Close.

Any development on this plot beyond the present garages shall still affect the light available to the side (north facing) and back windows (west facing). Since around 1990 I have displayed and claimed the rights of Ancient Lights by displaying of a notice by these windows. This has been recorded in every one of my objection letters since then. Any development would infringe my rights of removing establish daylight rights to my property.

It should be noted that the plot entrance is on the apex of a 90 degree blind bend of a narrow road. Since the last application from the previous owner most of the houses within the Close have changed ownership. With the new owners bringing 2, 3, or 4 vehicles to a household and thus increasing the parking and traffic in this narrow road. We are lucky in only having had one serious accident but visiting vehicles still drive too fast around the bend. Due to the narrow plot there will be no room for on-site parking of delivery Lorries or skips should the development go ahead. Therefore these will have to be parked on the narrow road near or on the blind bend. The affect will be to block the narrow Countisbury Close road and increase the likelihood of further serious accidents. Access by the householders in and out of the close will significantly be affected and could even close the road.

Summary Of Points For Rejection Of This Planning Application:

I have claimed Ancient Lights rights since 1990's as recorded in my objects to all of the previous series of planning application for the main source of daylight to the working area of our kitchen. Any increase in the structure of any dwelling replacing the garages shall impact the present light levels.

Access to the narrow plot for building traffic, skips is limited by the space available, narrow road and location is on a blind bend to cause major problems of safety, noise and disruption to the access to Countisbury Close and its householders. As there are more properties on the wrong side of the plot means an increase in the passing traffic than when previous application submitted.

I also still trust in the integrity of the various Planning Officials to once again consider and then reject this application for any type of dwelling. As was done for the dozens of past planning applications over a period of 12 years, due to the main fact that there has been no fundamental changes in the circumstances since that time to grant approval now. Particularly as the new owner is presenting the exactly the

same designs of dwellings, location upon the plot, that have previously be submitted and rejected even on appeal to the Government Dept.

Particularly as at least three appeals to the relevant Government Environment Dept. also rejected any dwelling planning application, including a chalet style bungalow at the back with a smaller property to the one proposed here, thus agreeing with the local Planning Dept. decision to refuse any further development of this narrow plot. A precedent has been set that no further dwelling development on this plot is acceptable given all the possible variations and changes to the development plans that had been submitted over the 12 year period.

There is no need to build on every small plot of lands to in-fill completely the whole of the Aldwick village. There still needs to be open spaces between properties particularly as this Close has small size gardens, and the loss forever of this open space would be significant.

A chalet style property would not be in keeping with the rest of Countisbury Close properties that are all Georgian style houses, and would stick out like a sore thumb.

The only change in this application is that the submitter is now a Development Company and not an individual. Acceptance of this proposal will further fuel the articles over the last few years in the local media about the independence of Council Planning Departments and the Development Companies.

Please consider my objects and refuse planning permission again. If a previously rejected application is now approved now, I would want an inquiry into why as no circumstances have changed.

As I agree with ARUN Councils of open policy and my objections to be available to be read by everyone, therefore I think it is OK to send copies of my objections to all the local media (Radio & TV, Newspapers)?

Yours faithfully,


Mr. W. Edwards.