Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0585/19

planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 15 April 2019 at 14:15
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 2:19 PM on 15 Apr 2019 from Mr Brian Beale.

Application Summary

Address: 14 Ring Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0QF

Proposal: Non-Material Amendment to approved AWDM/1272/15. Amendments: alteration to position of retaining wall on West boundary, formation of pedestrian entrance gate and steps to rear garden of 27 Norbury Drive and new pedestrian entrance gate to north side of electric gates; increase in cill height of front (south) first floor windows in proposed new dwellings and repositioning of roof light on ground floor projection at front of dwellings.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name: Mr Brian Beale

Email: [redacted]

Address: 2 Heyshott Close, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 0QJ

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:
- Design
- Other

Comments: I am writing regarding the above Non-Material Amendment as outlined in reference to AWDM/1272/15.

I have not objected to the development going on to the rear of my property but do object to the subsequent series of changes being requested to the original plans that were put forward.

The original plans showed no request for access to the newly developed lane adjacent to 27 Norbury Drive and this lane was to be solely for the use of the 2 properties being constructed.

The request to access this land from the rear of 27 Norbury Drive not only goes against the original approval given to the development but is entirely unnecessary due to perfectly good and viable access that number 27 has to the north side of the property into their garden and garage. The property boasts a drive sufficient to contain 4 vehicles not including the garage that exists on site. There is absolutely no need for additional access to be given via steps into the lane as requested in the current amendments.

In relation to this the new request to install an additional gate to the north side of the planned gates would not only look unsightly but be wholly unnecessary. If approval was given then why not use the original gates in the plan?

It is alarming that without confirmed approval from the planning department that work has already begun on the steps to the rear of 27 Norbury Drive into the lane.
It is not acceptable to commence a development and make subsequent changes along the way without formal approval from the relevant authorities and then to expect retrospective planning permission to be given running roughshod over formal regulations.

I do not object to the original development as previously approved for the building of the 2 new properties but I do object to the unnecessary design and addition to the changes giving access to the lane to the property at number 27 and certainly see no need for an additional gate which would ruin the original design to the entrance to this lane. As previously stated there is perfectly good access to the land at number 27 via their long drive on the north side of their property.