

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 03 December 2020 09:25
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: OBJECTION to PLANNING EP/124/20/HH - Little Dormers 23 Upper Drive, East Preston, BN16 1QN

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#)



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Daun Johnson <Daun.Johnson@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2020 13:19
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: OBJECTION to PLANNING EP/124/20/HH - Little Dormers 23 Upper Drive, East Preston, BN16 1QN

Daun Johnson
Technical Support Unit Assistant, Planning

T: 01903 737762
E: daun.johnson@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Dave and Sue Flanders [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2020 13:03
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: OBJECTION to PLANNING EP/124/20/HH - Little Dormers 23 Upper Drive, East Preston, BN16 1QN

To: Planning@arun.gov.uk
From Mr D Flanders, 59 Manor Road, East Preston, BN16 1PY - on 2nd December 2020

Application No: EP/124/20/HH

Site Address: Little Dormers, 23 Upper Drive East Preston, BN16 11PY

OBJECTION/COMMENTS TO THE PLANNING PROPOSAL EP/124/20/HH

To: The Case Officer, Arun Planning

Dear Andrew Wood,

Regarding Application EP/124/20/HH to build a double garage/ workshop in the front garden.

I have noted that two of the objections to the double garage/workshop for their “sporty cars” being placed in the front of the building suggest that the back-garden might be a solution for locating this large, overbearing building instead. I will explain the reasons why this ‘claimed’ compromise would NOT be acceptable to the local community, and why such a proposal would be catastrophic to the legally protected amenity of peaceful enjoyment for neighbouring properties and gardens.

There is a real fear by neighbours’ that the applicants’ have since arrival prepared themselves for a rejection on the front garden development, and have always had more than just a back-up plan to pursue this project, at whatever cost to their neighbours or neighbourhood. In this respect it should be noted that;

- they have pointedly not put the existing structure to the south of their front garden, where it would be less obtrusive. This would have overbearing implications for their own lounge and on the sunlight they currently receive.
- they have developed windows on the ground floor south-side. This could be shown on future plans that to put a garage in the normal place for an additional garage facility against the house, and towards the front of the property is unusable
- they have already removed part of the chimney along the south-side. This would assist cars to pass this point with ease
- they have already removed the substantial hedging alongside the south-side. This would enable cars to pass through to the rear garden

- they have never stated anywhere on their planning applications to date that they have removed the hedging/trees in preparation for any of their proposals to date. There is no reason to believe that they would start to include this information on any future application to develop the back-garden area

In respect of the suggestion itself, I would like to make it clear that we and others will object in the strongest possible way to such a planning application or alteration. The back-gardens to the south and west of the building are very small leisure areas and, along with our homes as well, we would be in relative, close contact with the garage/workshop building. This would be clearly unacceptable from both the noise and fumes element of a double garage/workshop. The building density of an already crowded dwelling area would be intensified by this large overbearing building. Also, the applicants would need some form of hard surfacing for turning and reversing back up the long, intended access driveway. (A gravel solution instead of hard standing would only add to the unwelcome noise.)

The gardens of 21 Upper Drive and 59 Manor Road narrow back gardens would, in effect, have a long 'roadway access' passing immediately next to their back-garden leisure areas with no 'buffer' in-between.

I note from a previous objection to this development (OWPC31707) that the applicants unsuccessfully petitioned the support of the Parish Council on the basis their "classic" and "sporty" cars didn't fit into the existing garage. As the objector also pointed out, these cars release large amounts of pollution; not then the ideal garden companions for residents enjoying their own peaceful back-garden pursuits.

I have no doubt that the intentions of the suggestions by the two objectors were well meant if ill thought out. This would not be the compromise as the objectors perceive it to be, but as we see it, part of the long-term aim of the applicants of getting the hugely disliked plans accepted in one way or another.

To conclude, it would be most undesirable and destroying of residential amenities to bring the noise and fuming elements of car engines, moving or non-moving, to the heart of neighbours' small, back-garden leisure areas. In this respect, it is well known in the neighbourhood that at least one of the applicants' "classic" or "sporty cars", for which this whole project appears to revolve around, has a very loud engine-noise level.

The severe limitations of the house, garden and neighbourhood to develop in the proposed manner of the application, either front or rear, are obvious and I believe would have been well known to the applicants before the purchase of the property earlier this year.

Yours sincerely

David Flanders

59 Manor Road, East Preston. BN16 1PY

