

Dear Sir; or Madam,

Planning Application: BR/16/18/PL.
(Log cabin; Hair dresser use: 131 Orchard Way)

I write as the next door neighbour to this Applicant and object to this proposal to erect a building nearly 19 feet long (5.7m), longer than the house, bigger than a vehicle garage, which would be incongruous in any Urban garden. Some two years, when they first started converting the original brick garden shed to trade, I asked this applicant to stop and was told it was "none of your business". I assured her it was, and that this was a Residential area.

On writing to Arun District Council seeking clarification then, I received written confirmation of my letter, and told I would be contacted later. I never heard from Arun D.C. again on this matter. Later, I had two ~~trade~~ confrontations on my doorstep from the applicants partner, the threat issued - "If you **** me off, I'll **** you off", then later, "Anyway, it's done now", meaning the shed was now converted; and activity commencing daily. The legality of that usage has still not been confirmed, or otherwise, by Arun D.C. to me.

I have always said I object to any commercial activity within the garden, a space, plain or ornate, for relaxation and to be cherished. My enjoyment is severely compromised as animated conversation from the open shed window ("Salon"), or women standing at the back of the house conversing, obvious their words can be heard three gardens away impinge on my home. I believe I have the legal right "to receive and enjoy privacy and respect" framed within both Domestic and E.U. Law and ask Arun D.C. to support and uphold those principles so enshrined.

I can tell trade and so footfall between our properties has increased, with up to three cars at a time parked outside our joint properties, ignoring the accepted protocol of not parking opposite residents vehicles, so there is continuous interruption of traffic flow that is now bus route, "rat run", and access to two schools and factory estate, and impede my safe access by vehicle to my property.

If this application succeeds, a most divisive precedent will be set, that could not be refuted later if others seek their own plans to annoy, harass or disturb their neighbours, implementing an Agenda. Legitimate business owners would be rightly

Contd. over.

aggrieved if they became aware of such a situation surely? The official Orange notice of building intention was displayed only briefly at the Property, being removed by the 27th February*, some nine days earlier than the end of the Consultation period of the 8th. March. I believe this invalidates this Application, also.

In summary I ask Arun District Council dismiss this Application for any, or all of the above reasons outlined.

* The Orange notice was reinstated on the 3rd. March; still not a continuous period of display.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

(M. MATTHEWS)