

[REDACTED]

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 21 May 2019 09:17
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: FG/220/18
Attachments: IMG_20190410_131731.jpg; IMG_20190410_131359.jpg

From: Andrew Wood
Sent: 17 May 2019 13:00
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: FG/220/18

Rep letter

Andrew Wood MRTPI | Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department, Arun District Council |
Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maitravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
[REDACTED]

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 April 2019 15:49
To: Andrew Wood
Subject: FG/220/18

Dear Andrew

Thank you for taking the time to talk to me last week about the development at Elm Lodge, Tamarisk Way Ferring.

I have a number of further observations to make, but first, as a matter of accuracy and fact, can I say that a formal objection was made by us to FG/186/18 (Elm Lodge modifications). A visit was made on 9/11/18 by Planning officer Stuart Corbey at our request, in order to express our range of objections. This included overlarge windows, and consequent lack of privacy vis a vis our garden and conservatory, inappropriate and unsympathetic materials and a totally out of character design. A follow up telephone call to Stuart confirmed that as he had details of our objection, any further correspondence from us was not required.

Many of the objections lodged against this application refer in one way or another to the 'openness' and symmetry of the respective gardens of Elm Lodge and neighbouring property Magalia. They are, in general referring to space without buildings rather than areas devoid of vegetation as the garden in Elm Lodge has become. By removing the trees, a valuable sanctuary for birds and wildlife has been lost, and there has been a noticeable diminution of bird life in the area.

I have provided pictures with 180 degree view that encompasses both the gardens, the exit from Tamarisk Way into Sea Lane and the trees and fields opposite. I think that this gives planning officials the most accurate view of Elm Lodge garden, its relationship with the immediate area and indicates the significant impact a new building would have. I believe the accuracy of these pictures will be more useful than the computer generated 'artists impression' provided by the applicant. I further make observation that the proposed style of building is not matched by any other building in the entire length of Sea Lane and therefore will be equally out of character in both Sea Lane and Tamarisk Way.

The pictures supplied indicate the dominance of this building as it would be viewed, by passing walkers, cyclists and visitors, from Sea Lane itself.

I cannot therefore understand how this application can conform to SD SP1 (contribution to the environment), SD SP1a h (conservation and enhancement of built heritage) or D DM1 (Historic character.... should be respected, taking into account the District identity and setting).

Kind regards

Peter
Peter Sims
Magalia, Tamarisk Way, Ferring



