

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Beach [REDACTED]

Sent: 14 June 2019 10:23

To: Anita Gardner

Subject: A/55/19/PL

Dear Mrs Gardener,

With regard to the application I would like to make two observations aimed at avoiding irreversible mistakes and damage to protected Local Green Space.

- a). The size and shape of the red outlined plot in A/55/19/PL does not match with a number of plans indicating where any extant plots may exist and in it's present form the application will compromise Protected Local Green Space/Green Belt as well as being outside the BUAB.
- b). The property described is the same property as in A/31/19/PL which was refused under policy HD5. Logically it should follow that A/55/19/PL should be similarly refused.

Regarding a).

Reference to a number of planning applications (A/52/60, A/84/59, A/85/59) shows the plots in question narrowing down from plot 5 to plot 9 as they go North.

The plans show the North edge of plot 6 being some 24m deep with plot 7 narrowing to some 21m deep. This carries on with plot 9 narrowing to some 13m at the furthest edge North.

That plots 8 and 9 narrow down was confirmed in a letter to planning on 10/6/60 associated with A/84/59 and filed in A/52/60.

All this is then in great conflict with A/55/19/PL showing it's "red rectangle" being some 29m deep along it's entire length.

A/115/16/HH shows Ashurst, plot 6 and incorporating part of plot 7, squared off but whether this was by design or accident when initially done it does not form a precedent for the plots beyond Ashurst. No boundary dimensions are shown but using Ashurst's present rear boundary as a possible starting point for any extant plots would be a false starting point.

As an additional reference I would refer you to the Adopted Arun Local Development Plan and Local Plan Policy Map 4. Map 4 clearly shows the rear boundaries of Ashurst and its neighbour narrowing down. Outside of the boundaries is Local Green Space and if the plots claimed in A/55/19/PL as part of the extant permission are allowed they will clearly be affecting Local Green Space, as also identified in the "made" ANDP as HMGC. The questionable part of the "red rectangle" of A/55/19/PL is a "triangle" from the SouthWestern end broadening to the NorthWestern end of the area which looks as if it should be protected Local Green Space. It is also the outside of the BUAB.

Being mindful of what The Inspector stated, in refusing the appeal on A/176/17/PL, the fallback position of the two plots (now the subject of A/55/19/PL) does not establish a principle for development on the site that would be contrary to the Local Plan when assessed against its current policies. Also, that the fallback position does not confirm that the principle of development is acceptable with regard to its compliance with the policies in the up to date Local Plan as the LDC application was not assessed against the Local Plan.

Policies HD1 and CLW2 apply as well as the various Arun policies on green infrastructure.

Regarding b).

The property is the same as in A/31/19/PL which was refused under Policy HD5. It is logical therefore that A/55/19/PL should be similarly refused, also with reference to D SP 1 and D DM 1.

Ham Manor Way does benefit from a range and style of properties but in the immediate area to A/55/19/PL the housing is characterised by chalet bungalows. Any development in this area should therefore follow the street scene and character of the area, under appropriate Arun and Angmering policies, and be chalet type properties.

It is worth again being mindful of The Inspector's comments where he stated that a scheme under the fallback would be contained in a more natural and considered line to reflect the established pattern of existing development, and create a permeable and more open grain of development. The proposal in A/55/19/PL puts a large house in the middle of the present open space on plot 9 which virtually fills the whole plot - or is greater than the narrowing proton the basis of the evidence in part a). Plot 8 is retained for future development. Even the house on plot 9 appears to go against The Inspector's guidance and a further property on plot 8 certainly would compound the situation creating a continuous built form against the open rural aspect of the area.

Assuring you of my best intentions.

Regards,

Brian Beach.