

Karen Garner

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 14 November 2017 16:12
To: Karen Garner
Subject: FW: WA/74/17/PL - Resubmission following WA/109/16/PL - Church Farm Bungalows, Binsted Lane, Binsted BN18 0LN
Attachments: 2088-13 ALT BLOCK PLAN.pdf

Please can this plan be added to the application

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 P Save the environment - think before you print.

-----Original Message-----

From: Simon Arch [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 November 2017 15:21
To: Planning
Cc: Anita Gardner
Subject: WA/74/17/PL - Resubmission following WA/109/16/PL - Church Farm Bungalows, Binsted Lane, Binsted BN18 0LN

Dear Sir/Madam

A single objection to application WA/74/17/PL is noted, referring principally to a neighbouring property because the proposal, "would be sited in front of Glebe House".

The applicant does not believe this to be quite the case; firstly prior approval WA/109/16/PL would indicate the setting of a listed building is unaffected and this resubmission to re-site the proposal slightly 'east' is for reasons already covered within the present application process, submitted Design & Access Statement and applicant covering correspondence.

Although the proposal is slightly "nearer" the shared vehicular access driveway, it is not seen as being forward of Glebe House. For the sake of clarity, attached plan 2088/13 shows a dashed-red outline of the original pair of semi-detached properties with outhouses, the dwelling approved by WA/109/16/PL edged-blue and this resubmission in black. Here you will note the subject location does not appear "in front of Glebe House" but is also principally within the bounds of the original semi-detached properties.

Further, given an 'east-west' aspect for both the subject site and adjacent property Glebe House plus distances between it is believed there is no additional loss of privacy by re-siting the already approved property moreso when the amenity area for the subject site is mainly of a westerly-facing aspect at the rear of the proposal.

Yours sincerely

Simon J Arch

[REDACTED]