

Sent: 26 July 2021 10:17

To: Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: 27 Central Drive

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Mr Crowther,

I note that I have received no reply to my email of 17th July in response to yours of 16th. It is not clear whether this is a manifestation of your threat to "blank" me or simply discourtesy but either is inappropriate in a paid public servant.

You made the baseless accusation that I have made unsubstantiated claims against Council officers. I have certainly not done so knowingly and unless you have evidence to the contrary I continue to expect an apology.

Your email is unclear with regard to the revised Planning Application in that you state that the Council has accepted that the development is not being built in accordance with the approved plans. Whilst this statement is clearly true, my understanding based on Mrs Coney's letter of 29th June is that the Council's position is that the departure from approved plans is only in respect of relatively minor details and one particular document – the street scene. She clearly states that the Council accepts that the height of the building accords with plans submitted and approved. It is however the height of the building which is the principal cause of complaint since it is quite out of proportion and therefore out of sympathy with its surroundings.

The grounds for complaint are that the height, whether approved or not, is based on plans which were misleading. I cannot know whether this was known and considered by the Planning Officer but I do know that the plans as published for public consultation certainly misled the public at large, and I have no doubt that if members of the public had been shown the true (or as built) overwhelming dominance of this building then there would have been many more objections.

It is central to the issue of considering the revised application as to whether the height is under review. Whilst the new application refers to removal/revision of condition 2 of the original approval, it would appear that as regards height the matter is pre-judged. Unless I am completely wrong on this, - and I very much hope that I am – then the question of how the original decision was reached is very far from being irrelevant, and I along with many others, only some of whom have formally objected currently, expect to be told how the decision regarding height was made in the original consideration.

It is to elicit the facts that I asked the questions in my emails to Mrs Coney and subsequently to Mr Vick. These are simple factual questions requiring simple factual answers which do not require lengthy investigation. I first asked these questions on 1st July. There is therefore no excuse for your failure to provide this highly relevant information in a timely manner. Further delay may well amount to an abuse of due process in that time-critical information is being withheld.

I trust that a request under the F.O.I. Act will not be necessary although this might be enlightening in that it would require additionally disclosure of all internal communications in the matter.

In view of the time limit before consideration of the present application this matter is urgent. If therefore I do not receive a reply within 24 hours (which means of course that you will have had more than a full week since my previous response) I shall take the matter up in the most public way and at the most senior levels. I trust this will not be necessary.

G A Raven