

Ronnie McGregor

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 23 April 2018 09:54
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application EP / 7 /18 / PL

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 23 April 2018 09:19
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning Application EP / 7 /18 / PL

Please treat as a rep

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

Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Lol Pilfold [mailto:[LOL.PILFOLD@ARUN.GOV.UK](#)]
Sent: 19 April 2018 18:55
To: Anita Gardner; Malcolm Fitzgerald
Subject: Planning Application EP / 7 /18 / PL

Dear Anita,

Thank you for your reply to my email regarding the planning application EP/7/18/PL which I now understand has been granted an extension and will be decided by committee sometime in May of this year.

I also note that a letter dated the 16th April was posted on 17th April on your website regarding this application by 'Appleton Town Planning' this being after the closing date for submissions on 22nd March 2018.

Whilst the letter's author agrees that legal/ownership matters are not material planning considerations it certainly seems to continue in that vein.

I would be obliged therefore if you would allow me to respond to the content of the letter to hopefully achieve a fair and balanced argument, especially as the decision will have a considerable effect on us and our neighbours ;

.. Firstly ,we have never considered the existing metal staircase used by Greenmanor's tenants to access their flats from their parked cars to be an "*impediment*"..

In fact it is a boon to those of an elderly disposition and the other tenants over the shops who have small children (including their accoutrements) who are allowed by the landlord to park at the rear of the shops

It forms the only access to the rear compound for tenants living over the shops from where they have been allowed by the landlord to park their vehicles regardless of their leases..***I agree that this also a legal issue but the tenants safety needs to be considered in planning matters and the relocation of the staircase effects this ..***

The landlord has made frequent visits since taking ownership of the property over the years and therefore the area can hardly be defined as ***uncontrolled***. Either the tenants and anyone else are allowed to park or not ..and seemingly they are . See previous objection photos. .. ***Again I appreciate this is a legal issue but the fact remains that from a planning viewpoint these vehicles may well be displaced and should be included as such ..***

I would agree however with Dawn Appleton that the landlord encouraging the parking of these vehicles has caused difficulties for both delivery vehicles to us and the retail outlets . This has been especially so when trying to egress/ingress our property with VW tow vehicle and race car trailer (see photo previously provided in objections).

....As Dawn Appleton kindly points out in her letter, we have a ***"Legal Right of Way to 125 North Lane"*** and of course we have the legal right to park 3 vehicles on the land in question (which wasn't mentioned....)

The "improved access" on the western side with yellow lines and ***"enforceable no parking"*** will further impact upon the tenants of the retail outlets who park there at present to load and unload, as they would have to utilise the parking at the front. This is supposed to be for customer parking and limited waiting time dependent, in addition it may not necessarily be available when required for loading and unloading .. ***again these vehicles should be included as being displaced ...***

Are the delivery vehicles/waste disposal vehicles using this new improved Western access route for the shops and flats able to access this narrow entrance ? ...and are they expected to reverse back out into Beechlands Close ?, clearly they will not be able to turn around and therefore, is that safe practice ?

Furthermore I would have thought that a door opening out onto this new vehicular non public route would have to be considered an obstruction/hazard to one party or another. This being especially so as the pedestrian access would be under a ***"not uncommon shared surface arrangement"*** and ***"no pedestrian zones would be***

required". Even the sensible inclusion of a pavement would not prevent a hazard to those walking past these doors. This would also further restrict the width of the route for vehicles having to use it.

The photographs I provided were to give you an insight into the number of vehicles being displaced and which would in the event of this application being approved, have to find 'on street' parking in the vicinity. Obviously they would be allowed to take the parking spaces intended for customers in the parade until 10 am under the current 2 hour restriction, but I fail to see how that advantages anybody running one of the retail outlets or indeed the vehicle's owners for that matter.

The vehicles delivering to the front of the shops are a separate issue and I was merely commenting that their numbers would increase proportionately if the application were to go ahead.

The tenants of flat numbers 139 & 143 have no internal staircase to allow direct access to the front parade, even though it still appears on some plans.

It was removed to allow the expansion of 'One Stop' in a previously approved planning application by Arun D.C.

The only original internal staircase to the front parade is situated between flats 129 & 133 close to where the proposed fire escape is to be sited.

The distance for the young family in flat 143 to the new proposed fire escape is unaltered at 34 metres and the landlord's most recent tenants adjacent to them in flat number 139 have a little one and are expecting another child soon.

If there is a fire in either of the 2 Northern end flats over the shops, numbers 129 (over fish & chip shop) & 133, then there is no viable safe means of escape for the residents if the fire escape were to be relocated as per the plan.

In these circumstances people including young children would be directed towards the hazard via the various obstructions on the balcony, the question being and one has to ask it "is that acceptable given recent events?"

As residents of 125 North Lane for the last 43 years we do not consider **"The Standard"** 10 metres from the rear boundary relevant when it comes to our loss of amenity, common sense dictates otherwise.

..and as for the term **"assessed upon demolition"** that is a meaningless statement a structure either demolished, remains or is rebuilt accordingly, preferably with the necessary means to support it..

We also hope these additional comments will both clarify and assist in the consideration of the application,

Kind regards Laurence & Doreen Pilfold