

From: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 16 August 2021 10:02
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: 27 Central Drive M/91/21/PL

Please treat as a rep

Anita Gardner
Principal Planner

T: 01903 737529
E: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk



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

From: g raven [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 July 2021 11:07
To: Anita Gardner <Anita.Gardner@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Jacky Pendleton [REDACTED]
Subject: 27 Central Drive M/91/21/PL

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 Mrs Gardner,

May I draw your attention to two very significant items in the Design Statement which formed part of the documentation submitted with the original planning application M/25/19. The first, under "Principles" states " 1. To be in context and respect the existing residential area character. 2. To minimise any impact on adjoining properties." The second, under "Scale" states " The scale of the house is in keeping with its near neighbours in both height and massing".

The apparent intention thus stated is entirely in keeping with the drawings which show the new house as approximately level with next door. It is only at odds with the building as constructed.

The builders consistently claim that the height is entirely as approved. I do not know exactly what is meant by this since as far as I can see the approval does not specify the height in figures merely stating that the building must be constructed in accordance with the plans.

It seems to be the case that what was actually approved was a representation of, among other things, the height. If the builders' claim is true, that representation was inaccurate and misleading and should invalidate the approval. I do wonder whether, somewhere along the line, it is the scale which is either wrong or has been wrongly applied in scaling up from the drawings, and if so does this mean that not only the height but other dimensions are oversize.

I am aware of very many people who disapprove of the size of this building, and I know personally of a number who have objected in writing without their objections appearing on the website at the time of this email. Whilst I am aware that there are delays in posting I know of at least one case who wrote more than a week ago and received an acknowledgement but has not yet had their objection posted. I feel that this gives a false picture to anybody who may look at the website and consider making an objection. To the extent that some people are influenced by what they see being done by others, these delays may prejudice matters.

There is considerable strength of feeling in this matter, both in the immediate neighbourhood, in the wider local area and also more widely still from those who come from elsewhere to visit our beach. All of these people will be outraged if this egregious error, whether accidental or deliberate, is allowed to be perpetuated by approving the current application to the lasting detriment of our environment.

I know that you are giving this matter your careful and proper attention and trust that you will find my bringing forward these matters helpful.

G A Raven