

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 22 May 2018 08:32
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Y/19/18/L and Y/18/18/PL
Attachments: planning objection to garage doors.pdf

X Two objection letters

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2018 07:45
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: Y/19/18/L and Y/18/18/PL

Dear Sirs

Please find attached letter of objection to the above applications from D.C.Lownsborough

Regards

Paul Clarke
Director

PDK Architecture and Surveying



29 Breach Avenue, Southbourne, Emsworth, Hampshire, PO10 8NB.

This e-mail is confidential. If you receive it by mistake, please inform us immediately and delete it from your system. You should not copy, disclose, or distribute its contents to anyone nor act in reliance on this e-mail, as this is prohibited and may be unlawful.
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Planning Objection, with to Planning and Listed Building Consent
Planning refs. Y/19/18/L and Y/18/18/PL

To:- The Chief Planning Officer
Arun Civic Centre.
Maltravers Rd.
Littlhampton, West Sussex.
BN17 5LF

From:- D.C.Lownsborough, The Potting Barn, No.5, Hobbs Court, Blsham Rd.
Yapton, West Sussex BN18 OJY.

May 21st 018

Without Prejudice

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object on the following grounds, additional details follow on.
(It is felt necessary, to include all aspects of objection for clarity, but not to be considered or interpreted in terms of 'complaint' at this time. It is felt impossible to present this planning objection otherwise, without including all aspects in this scenario as they are considered to have occurred or their effect).

1. The planning application for doors in place of car ports was apparently approved in reference to plan BRO10 revised, July 14th 015.

2. There was an opportunity for the 3 households in the application now, to have submitted an application against the Planning and Listed Building consent approval, for the approved doors at the time, but they failed to do so. **I object** on that basis and as: -

Non-compliant doors were apparently installed instead, contrary to the previous approvals, and in a relatively short time after planning approval had been given. **I object** to this action on the basis, that *if planning permission may have been disregarded, it may also appear, that such actions are condoned if approval is given later.*

3..The 4th garage owner, not included in this application, did not install any doors at all, but inherited a boarding up and side opening door, placed there by the developer of the site, prior to property purchase, and was awaiting his content to be removed for over a year, before their own doors installation could be considered.

When the breaches were advised to *all* 4 properties in ownership of garages in the block, the Conservation Officer's comments stated:-.

"The doors affixed are considered to give a simulated look to the garage block. Up and over doors apparently of a wood veneer with false hinges applied.

The doors in situ are considered to represent harm to a listed building, in that they are out of character and are of insufficient quality to weather well. It is considered unlikely, in the event that an application was submitted, to reflect the current doors in place, that it would be supported in Heritage terms.

The doors should be pairs of solid timber, outward opening, with functioning black door furniture and stained as per plans approved.

All the doors should be identical to maintain the visual harmony."

Breached conditions were then listed and continue:-.

"In order to resolve this matter it will be necessary to ensure that all the doors in place, are replaced by what has been approved.

The necessary changes will have to be made by the end of March 018."

The Compliance officer who conveyed these comments to all garage owners advised: ***'Should the door detail not be rectified within the timescale stated I will be obliged to recommend more formal means to resolve'***.

4. **I object**, on the basis that if the planning application is approved, *then it would be seen that the outcome would not conform to the Conservation requirements* as specified above, because the doors will never be the same as the compliant doors installed, as part of the same block. Compliant doors are already in a different wood, style, (plain not bordered), door furniture, in colour and overall finish because of different base materials, side opening, not up- and- over doors electrically operated. Also, they will have been *replaced* as advised, and those in the application not. Also, that one party was advised to conform 'to the letter' to install compliant doors, whilst others apparently not required to do so in the same situation.

4a. **I object**, if it was not able to be seen as even-handed to all in this scenario, or, *appeared to penalise one party* whilst apparently seeming to favour any others in terms of any breach.

5. **I object** because at present, one householder, included in the statement of breach, but not included in this application, *was required from the start, and over approximately 7 months to comply* with the above details *in full*, and to submit every aspect of proposed installation of doors to be seen to comply, with a cut off date of end of March 018 for completion as advised. The detailing continued in relation to their requirement:-.

Their doors along with all others were therefore required to be replaced and all other specifications to be adhered to according to planning ref understood to be Y/70/15/L. architect plan ref 509A0060.

((Their replacement doors, have already been approved in writing, by Planning and Listed Building Consent/Conservation as compliant, and are going forward on that basis. It is able to be verified, that the doors were placed on order and payment made *before* this planning application was submitted))).

6. **I object**, that If one individual in the same scenario, may be seen to be singled out to be compliant, but in a disadvantaging way *financially* to a four figure sum over others, it would be objected to on the grounds of being apparently divisive, discriminatory and punitive. It would also appear to fly in the face of all the earlier specific recommendations and observations by the Conservation Officer as stated above, apparently rendering them meaningless.

7. **I object**, because after many months, and not until an apparent comment in writing, by Conservation in February 018 *was there any suggestion to the one party* to indicate that any change may be acceptable at all regarding up-and – over doors. I have no record of this initial advice received as email, now on the website from the Conservation Officer.

8.**I object**, if there isn't to be *an even –handed outcome in all aspects* applied to *all* regarding breach. As in:- advice applied to one party from the start in terms of what they *must* do, as opposed to apparent advice to others later, *that they may not have to*, and may only need to make a minor adjustment instead. That advice, did not state that the *replacement of doors* may no longer be required either, nor that they may no longer *required to all be the same*. It only related to the possibility of them as may be acceptable as –up and –over doors. **I object** if replacement and uniformity is not upheld on that basis.

8a.This advice was first discovered not from Conservation, but from an alternative email source. Confirmation was apparently received from Compliance (not Conservation) when it was raised thereafter, on March 7th 018. Compliance advice then suggested that a planning application outcome could now be awaited. This was not considered appropriate when purchase of doors was already going ahead as approved compliant, and when *it was already advised to be acted on by all, from November 017*. Also, that ***all doors were to be replaced and all to be the same, with a cut off date for installation (end pf March 018), otherwise further action would be taken.***

9). The compliant doors to the one property as submitted and agreed at every stage will be installed as required. **These are plain and without borders**. If the application is successful, the garage block *will never look the same* because of this. **I object** on that basis.

10. The style of doors in the application, have 'visible borders'.

During the process of compliance by the one property, an approval request was made, for doors to be *with* frames/borders, as for another property on site elsewhere. This was emphatically denied to be installed as being non-compliant within the garage block in respect of breach.

I object on the grounds that *the borders were rejected as being non-compliant* (twice) and was stated as such, both as understood in the initial breach advice by Conservation, and by Compliance advice subsequently, that they must be plain instead (as per the original approved plan).

11. One householder has been required to *remove existing substance*, and will have to expend many thousands of pounds to be compliant, even though they were *not responsible for the installation of existing boarding and door.* (No type of wood was specified on the original plan and the door was side opening, so could just be wood stained too).

I object that if the application is approved, then the existing and non-compliant doors would seem, *may only require a pot of wood-stain and some door furniture to require approval.*

I believe that any perceived **objection** with regard to inequality and injustice in outcome, if this should be the case, is apparent.

12. I object on the basis of one breach to an opening having to be replaced if others are not.

The compliant doors will be different in style if the application goes through and all should be the same.

Style of door, door furniture and wood stain are from a company, NDC, and approved as compliant. *If the doors are all to be the same in the block as advised, and would otherwise be in breach as initially stated, then they would appear to have to be replaced* from that company, with the same door furniture and wood-stain too, to ensure that they are all the same now, as stated that they should be.

13 **I object** to the '*over-painting/staining*' of existing doors, as they are currently of a different type of base material to those agreed compliant, and they are already 'treated'. There is no way to be certain how this will adhere to doors already 'treated' and of a substantially different base colour. There is no guarantee that the doors would all look the same as specified, because of this.

14. **I object** to the apparent *difficulty* by the applicants regarding car access to a garage with side opening doors. The property with compliant side opening doors will have no difficulty accessing with their own car, so it is not a universal problem.

15.. **I object** to the implication that the *size of aperture for access* to garages would be difficult because of side opening doors too.

The plan supplied shows car access only in a forward direction, not in relation to reversed parking into the space, in generality, perhaps considered to be easier.

16. **I object** on the basis that only drawings and no other calculations have been supplied to confirm difficulty regarding access to the garages. As this is hearsay and not evidence **I object to this hypothesis is on that basis.**

17. The measurements for openings to garages for 2 garages in the application are of apparently similar size.

The third and fourth garages are seen to be 2880 and 3610. The latter being considerably larger than any on the block for ease of access. With a combined total of 6,490, and whereby no wall between the two garages exists, **I object**, on the basis that *this should be more than adequate* to access, to the diagonal if necessary. The garage with wider doors also has additional depth, which is not universal to all garages.

18. **I object** because *personal choice of car, where its size may also be reflected in this application, and modes of driving skills*, are not understood to be grounds for a Conservation or Planning issue. *A revision to car ports* has already been offered as an alternative to all householders as remedy. ***This would also appear to comply with the recommendation, that existing doors must be replaced..*** There are also additional parking spaces/bays for each resident in the application on site too, as well as garages, but the former are not shown on the application..

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsbrough.