

Mrs. A. Gardner
Development Control
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

My ref: RLS/18.02/17/AR

Your ref: A/87/18/PL

26th July 2018

Dear Mrs. Gardner

Proposed Single Dwelling: Land at the Ninth Tee, Ham Manor Way, Angmering.

I am writing to you now in respect of the above and to object on behalf of my clients to this application as I have done previously.

In refusing the original application for two units (reference A/176/17/PL) the application was quite correctly rejected having regard to the policies of the development plan in that the site was in the countryside and also it amounted to development of protected local green space. Whilst a further application has been submitted (A/212/17/CLP) this does not change in any way any of the important factors before your Council, all as previously known to the officers of your Council, and on that basis nothing has changed at all in respect of this application. In rejecting the proposal it shows the rear garden to the new dwelling projecting out beyond the line of the submitted CLP boundary. This of course projects directly into the designated Local Green Space and also into open countryside and is therefore contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan as contained in both the Angmering Neighbourhood Plan, Policies HD1 in respect of the Countryside and HD5 and CLW2 for Local Green Space and also the recently published and adopted Arun District Local Plan, both of which are now formally part of the Development Plan for development within Angmering. In the circumstances I see no other decision other than a refusal of planning permission.

This latest application, however, also raises further issues of concern. The application site sits in the middle of open land on the west side of Ham Manor Way. To the north is a matching plot which we understand is now at appeal, albeit no details have been made available for public consideration as I understand no start date issue has been presented in respect of this appeal. In the circumstances if planning permission were to be granted for this single plot then as light follows day he will also seek planning permission for the second, either by application to Arun District Council or at the appeal now before the Inspectorate. Such an approach where adopted by a developer has to be considered to be totally unacceptable and it seems apparent to me that this is the applicant's clear intention. This proposal runs wholly contrary to the submissions made within the submitted Policy and Design Statement but it is simple reality that planning permission for one will be followed by

the second at appeal making your job and my job far more difficult notwithstanding that these proposals are wholly unacceptable. What I find fascinating is that this developer has gone on record as stating that he only wanted one dwelling on this site for his daughter but why on earth submit an application for two when you are only going for one now! It is patently obvious to all concerned that he has no intention of developing this other than to secure maximum yield on this site for the development, raising a third issue.

In following on from this the second issue raised is perhaps also a dramatic in itself. To the south of this single plot is land subject to the CLP permission for one of the two units permitted through that recently submitted proposal. On face value it may appear narrow, however, the parcel of land to the north of Ashurst is still available for development as this parcel remains following the original decision to give Ashurst a longer and wider back garden area: a decision made many years prior to these proposals. Although Ashurst has been extended this parcel remains available from the 1958 consent and in this respect it would substantially widen the plot of land to the south of this proposed dwelling. It is my submission, that with the addition of this 6 metre wide parcel of land, as contributing to the development of the southernmost the two CLP dwellings, this land is now available for development, subject to layout and design. If one looks to the land opposite on the submitted site plan presented with this application (1:500) the plot widths of the land appears adequate to provide three units as comparisons with other plots locally. All of this in my submission is wrong and it appears wrong even from the first consideration of this proposal in 1958! Even so smaller dwellings could still be built on this land diminishing the lengths of the rear garden areas (as compared to the development opposite) and that would still present the opportunity for three units of development across the frontage of this open space forming the space before the 9th Tee.

If it were the intention to propose one single unit I would have expected this to follow the basic principles established in the development of Ashurst with a chalet style dwelling and a private amenity space to be provided to the south of that unit. This will enable a dwelling more in keeping with the locality, consistent with the areas local visual amenities and at the end of the day appropriate within the area having regard to the history of approving a development on this site in 1958.

Whilst my clients are aware of the comments made by Southern Water previously I am certain that a new unit can be provided here that avoids existing pipes that cross under the frontage from north to south. In this respect one has to acknowledge the position established (in 1958) that allows future development here but the applicant does not want to build two small units (in comparison) on the basis of what has been presented, submitting a scheme for one large unit for consideration now. Whatever his intentions may be there is no reason, or even an excuse, to allow further housing development to expand into the protected areas of the golf course and challenging the only recently safeguarded decision to adopt this land as Local Green Space, a decision which I understand was unanimously supported within Angmering by over 95% of those who responded to the then emerging Angmering Neighbourhood Plan.

Finally, the last matter that I wish to focus on is the design of this unit. As one travels north along Manor Way the appearance of the street scene is primarily of bungalows and chalet style dwellings. I acknowledge that the design to the north contains a number of houses with a group of three to the immediate north of this site this design of unit does not fit in with the appearance of the street scene as one travels northwards along Ham Manor Way. One has to recognize that the building appears located on the lower ground level within the gap, however, it is still a substantial two-storey force of development across the frontage of the site which is larger and more prominent in style than a chalet style dwelling.

I will leave you now to duly reflect upon the matters raised in this letter. In terms of the principal issue as raised this application should clearly be refused as it extends the garden area to the rear well beyond the land allocated under the CLP into protected Local Green Space into the Countryside beyond and must therefore be contrary to the provisions of the Development Plan which are in themselves up to date. There is also the intention of the applicant, which I maintain is clearly material to his decision-making, in looking to expand the nature of the development in either direction to the north and south which will have a grossly unacceptable effect upon my clients who live and adjoin this site in the context that for many many years this open space has remained undeveloped and free of future housing to their outlook and enjoyment.

Yours sincerely,

R.L. Stubbs

Cc: Clients Ham Manor Way