79 Irene Avenue,
Lancing,
West Sussex.
BN 15 9 NY.
5th March 2014.

Mr P Barnett,
Adur & Worthing Council Planning Services,
Portland House,
44 Richmond Road,
Worthing.
BN11 1HS

18 MAR 2014
PLANNING SERVICES

Ref: Planning application AWDM/0227/14.

Dear Sir,

I wish to object to this planning application on two counts,
1) Previous council decisions.
2) Lack of /default in procedure.

Previous council decisions.

When plans for a housing development on the old Willows school site were first put before the council, over three hundred local people objected to the proposal, as did the Parish Council. When the matter was put before the Adur District council planning committee, they rejected the proposal.

Some time later the developers submitted a second planning application, this to was subject to considerable public concern, and again Adur District Council rejected the plans.

Not content with the decision of the council and ignoring the concerns of the objectors, the developers took the matter to a planning enquiry which overruled the council and granted planning permission subject to certain conditions. My submission is that the planning inspector passed the plans as presented to him at the time of the enquiry against the wishes of the District Council, the Parish, Council, and a considerable number of local residents. Had these so called improvements, been made prior to the planning enquiry, there is a possibility that the planning inspector would have come to a different conclusion and dismissed the appeal.

Austin's the developers have a number of signs at this and other sites of theirs saying how good their developments are, if that is true, I find it hard to believe that they have only just thought of these improvements. I would suggest that they submitted plans to the inspector which they thought more beneficial to their case at that time, with the intention of making an application to alter them once the inspector had found in their favour.

Lack of or default in procedure.

I have spoken to four local residents, they all claimed to have no knowledge of application AWDM/0227/14, and have denied receiving any notification regarding the changes Austin's wish to make. As these people objected to the original development,

live close to it, and may be affected by the proposed changes, I think it only right and proper that they, like myself, should have been given official notification of the application.

To sum up, I am of the opinion that because the district council objected to this development in the first place they should not allow any change, however small or seemingly insignificant it might be. The matter should be referred to the original planning inspector in order that he could consider how the alterations may have affected his original decision. I am also of the opinion that all the residents (particularly those who objected to the development) living around the site should have been informed of this application and been given an opportunity to comment.

Yours Sincerely,

[redacted]

E.G.Bull.