3344688

Royal Mail
Gatwick
Mail Centre
15/07/2024
18:23:29
2273505002

British Heart Foundation
Royal Mail supporting heart health with BHF
bhf.org.uk



Attention of: Lauren Fongauffier → Case Officer
(FORMAL WRITTEN REPRESENTATION — PLANNING APPEAL)

Case Team:
WEST 3

TEMPLE QUAY HOUSE,
2 THE SQUARE,
BRISTOL
BS1 6PN

REGISTRY
17 JUL 2024
RECEIVED

REGISTRY
17 JUL 2024
RECEIVED

Attn of Lauren Fongauffier,

Temple Quay House,

2 The Square,

Bristol,

BS1 6PN

From: Mr Andrew Avison,

Flat 3, 27 Church Walk,

Worthing,

West Sussex,

BN11 2LS

10 July 2024

Formal Written Representation.

This is my written representation in respect of an Appeal.

The Application number is **AWDM/1451/23**

Planning Inspectorate Number is **APP/M3835/W/24/3344688**

I am a neighbour and lived for a number of years in a property opposite the proposed development.

For many years before the subject property was built, it was an eyesore and a wreck of what appeared to be a dilapidated garage and ancillary store. It was a blight on the other buildings in the street and spoilt the amenity.

The subject property was demolished and in its place a properly considered and building has been completed with consideration to the materials and finish to compliment the existing buildings in the street. It looks very attractive and has generous parking space and amenity in the form of attractive paving with outlook onto a maintained garden area.

I have read that the ' **Proposed Development** ' as being: ' **Retention of detached pitched roof building to rear, to be used as a garage / store plus occasional use as habitable accommodation.** '

To my mind this proposal is an excellent proposition. It makes sense to use the buildings that exist efficiently and serve people's needs and requirements.

Not only do I not object to application as to the buildings intended use, but I also fully support the applicant and disappointed that the planning department in Worthing had ever refused the previously submitted planning application in the first instance.

It is most unfortunate that the applicant has been put to the further expense and effort in seeking the granting of the permission that quite frankly could and should have been granted in the first place.

The proposed use of the building is logical and serves useful purposes. What sense would it serve that a building that exists is not available to be used that can be properly and efficiently used for the purposes set out in the 'Proposed Development' as detailed in this appeal ? I really should not need to state anything more.

Logic and common-sense dictates to me that the applicants appeal should be upheld and the application granted.

There is a great need for both more housing and for more storage space and workspace. The fact is that existing buildings can serve existing needs and by making more efficient use of existing buildings.

I am disappointed and feel angry that taxpayers are footing the bill to deal with this appeal when, in my opinion the application could and should have been granted in the first instance. It appears Prima facie that local planning authorities who deny applications whose decisions are then in effect overturned upon appeal should face the sanction of costs of the successful applicant and the Planning Inspectorates incurred costs, (being both necessary and reasonable in amount). This I believe would serve all parties properly and fairly and I think would make the most efficient use of all parties resources.

I support the applicant's submitted appeal.

Mr Andrew Avison.

[redacted]