

[REDACTED]

From: Julie Grieves on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 14 June 2019 08:35
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Objection A/55/19/PL
Attachments: Bungalows A5519PL.pdf

Julie Grieves - (Working days Monday 8.30am-2.15pm, Tuesday 8.30am-4.45pm, Thursday & Friday 8.30am-2.15pm)
| Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |

[REDACTED]
Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk P Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 13 June 2019 16:58
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection A/55/19/PL

[REDACTED]

Anita Gardner | Principal Planner, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

[REDACTED]

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk  Save the environment - think before you print.

From: james mimpriss [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 June 2019 16:44
To: Anita Gardner
Subject: Objection A/55/19/PL

Good afternoon Mrs Gardner

I have submitted my objection on the Arun portal reference OWPC23465. However I wanted to include an attachment document. Could you please organise this to be included for consideration.

Many thanks

Best regards

James

Mimpriss

Helios

Ham Manor Way
Angmering
West Sussex
BN16 4JQ

James Mimpriss
[REDACTED]

I object to A/55/19/PL for the same reason as A/31/19/PL with few additional material reasons.

The proposed property is too big in itself for the plot size bearing in mind it's one of two units, Street scene and Build form. It claims it the same area as Badgers but on a much smaller plot. Arun's recommendation report , A/31/19/PL, reference design quoted the following " However whilst the design of the dwelling is considered acceptable the proposal would adversely affect the character of the area and is therefore contrary to policy." This is the same property design and size as the refused A/31/19/PL.

Existing dwelling in front and to the SW of this proposed development are bungalow/chalet bungalow style properties on similar sized or larger plots, this was the desired Street scene during the original 1950s planning permission granting. On the Arun files, a letter can be found dated 25th January ,1957 for plan No. A/2/57 second paragraph states " East Drive , which is the main entrance to the golf courses, on this plan, to be entirely two storey dwellings, and two areas have been reserved for bungalows of individual designs on 50' minimum plots on Manor Way. This is, of course, an area in which bungalows have been approved and built in recent years." Please see attachment enclosed.

As shown on the submitted plan drawing, drawing number 1202.02.c, the proposed property is positioned a long way forward of the historical build line which can be seen from aerial photo's on Google map. On both sides of Ham Manor Way there is a defined line where properties are not built in front of. This again demonstrates the property is too big for the plot size whilst trying to gain a back garden.

In the design and Access Statement supplied by the developer it states under the title AMOUNT " the additional plot to the South will be used as garden to the proposed house" This offers neighbouring residents no protection or any guarantee in the future that a similar sized house could be built, dramatically changing the street scene. If this application is approved a 106 agreement should be undertaken to remove the southern building plot as an acceptance of a bigger form of property that was not initially intended with the original design of the estate.

In the same document under NEIGHBOURHOOD CONSIDERATION it states there are no side facing first floor windows, if planning is allowed then this should be enforced on the permission for both first floor and ground floor to prevent overlooking neighbours to the SW and NE with a material change later.

This new property would completely spoil the existing well established street scene of Ham Manor Way and would spoil the look of the immediate area (HDS and DDM1) and I would ask you respectfully to reject this new application on what is now local green space.

✓
1/20/77

25th January, 1977

Dear Mr. Anderson,

Plan No. 1/2/77 - Outline application, Banglades and
Long, San Juan, Santa Fe, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Your Committee will recall that some few weeks ago they asked us to get in touch with the owners of this estate in an endeavour to have a plan submitted to them for their consideration -- a basis for the development, not only for the vicinity of plans, but also as to the location in which some houses and banglades were to be created. At that time I informed your Committee that I had discussed the Banglades and Long with the developers and had asked for a grouped design of banglades in one of the areas which your Committee felt suitable for banglades, and I understood from Mr. [Name] that this application is put in as a basis for the sale of the plots in the estate.

It will be seen from this application that on the Thatching only dwelling houses are to be created. I think this is a good idea from the point of view of residents in the area although I believe there are no banglades approved in the Thatching although it has never been built. During some Thatching had houses are to be either side of the entrance drive to what is perhaps the best house in this part of the estate, and the banglades are to the south of that. Last house, which is the main entrance to the golf course is, on this plan, to be entirely two storey dwellings, and the area have been reserved for banglades or individual designs on 1/4 acre plots or less say. This is, of course, an area in which banglades have been approved and built in recent years.

From a review of this is, I feel, the best way of attempting to guarantee that the standards of the existing development on this estate will be maintained. It will appear, of course, that the banglades area will go first because of the actual ground in this locality, but nevertheless with this plan in front of us I think we could have a reasonable basis for rejecting banglades in the estate such as the Thatching which this plan allows for two storey development.

I would therefore recommend that the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

To the satisfaction and subsequent approval of detailed plans and elevations, together with details of the sitting and plot plans.

The reason for this condition is in order to comply with the requirements of the R.D.C. 1976.

T.J.A.