Ref. AWDM/0585/19

Mrs M R Black
29 Norbury Drive
LANCING
West Sussex
BN15 0QQ

22. April 2019

Mr. Barnett,
Planning Services.
Adur & Worthing Councils.
Worthing, West Sussex BN11

ADUR & WORTHING
IHS
25 APR 2019
PLANNING SERVICES

Dear Mr. Barnett,

Re. Amendments to approved plans AWDM/1272/15

There are 3 separate amendments presented as a "job lot!
The most significant is nestled between 2 less controversial issues. It is this I wish to object to -

"formation of a pedestrian entrance gate and steps to rear garden of 27 Norbury Drive.

The original plan approved in March 2016 did not include an access from the newly developed road into the rear garden of 27 Norbury Drive via Boundary 3.
The Report by the Director of Economy, 15 Feb. 2016 does not refer to this point of access to number 27 or to any other adjoining properties.
The new road was solely for the use of the new houses at the rear.

Additional access from Boundary 3 is totally unnecessary
27 Norbury Drive has a generous drive to the north of the property. It's details are evident on the plan AWDM/1590/18 accompanying another retrospective amendment to change the door design and change of use for the replacement "garage". This amendment was submitted by the owners of number 27 and was subsequently approved.

The drive offers direct access to the garage and rear garden - no need to construct a gate and steps just a few metres away. No need to negotiate electric gates and no danger of meeting vehicles entering or leaving the new houses via a narrow road.

The pedestrian access and steps (already started!) are simply a bonus, a "frill" for the garden design of number 27. This is a far, far cry from the plans approved 3 years ago in 2016.

Maintenance strip and gate is yet another late amendment and certainly lacks clarity. The block plan suggests that there will be a solid boundary (a fence perhaps?) but the detail suggests a marked or imaginary line.

Has the position of the electric gates altered to facilitate this change?

The proposed small gate at the front would enable ~~the~~ pedestrian access to allow maintenance work, so why not put a gate at the other end? This would enable access directly from the rear garden - hence, no need for an access from the new road. It would be more cost effective and, at least, show some respect for the approved plans.

The practice of drip-feeding amendments puts owners/builders into a pick and mix situation, while those of us whose lives have been negatively affected are totally reliant upon the planning department to enforce the plans they have previously approved.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]