

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 October 2020 11:06
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Objection to Planning Reference P/97/20/PL

Objection.

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737674
E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk



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

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Paul Chase [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 October 2020 11:03
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to Planning Reference P/97/20/PL

Dear Mr. Davis,

Please post the following objection to P/97/20/PL on the ADC planning portal on our behalf, as the email link within the portal has been disabled, thank you.

We would be grateful for an acknowledgement to this email.

Kind regards

Paul & Carole Chase.

27thOctober, 2020.

Dear Sir/Madam

Objection to:
Planning Reference P/97/20/PL
Summer Lane Development amendment

We write to object to the above amendment to plan P70/19/RES in the strongest possible terms, which attempts to increase the number of dwellings already planned by in excess of 70% of the original number approved (from 21 to 36).

There is already a significant issue with the additional number of vehicles which will need to use the restricted access of Summer Lane, caused by the new housing originally planned within P70/19/RES.

Consequently, the quantity of traffic using Summer Lane will increase yet again. It has already been established that there is a pinch point where two cars will be unable to pass.

In addition to the number of extra cars, with extra dwellings now proposed there will be increased need for large service, refuse and emergency vehicles, which can alone fill the width of the lane.

This is simply not a practical proposition and is unsafe. It is likely to cause real and unresolvable problems with access, increasing to potentially dangerous levels at peak times.

Furthermore, there is also a point of principle here.

The plan had already been accepted, despite many issues raised in objection including the above.

If all planning proposals could be increased by 70% in volume after the plans were approved, then it would make a mockery of the planning approval system, becoming ultimately meaningless. Once the principle has been established the planning system would then be open to abuse.

Consequently, again this is totally unacceptable.

Accordingly, we reject the planning reference P/97/20/PL for all of the above reasons.

Yours faithfully

Paul & Carole Chase
Owners of
Church View
Summer Lane
Nyetimber
PO21 4NQ