Planning Department
Adur District Council
Council Offices
Shoreham by Sea
East Sussex
BN43 6PR

47 Ullswater Road
Sompting
Lancing
West Sussex
BN15 9UG
[redacted]

Saturday 20th November 2010

Dear Mr. Morgan,

Planning Application Objection: ADC/0425/10 - 51 Ullswater Road, Sompting BN15 9UG

Thank you for your letter dated 16th November, which I received this morning.

I was most surprised you have no trace of having received my letter dated 12th July, a copy of which was enclosed with my letter to you of 6th November.

On 12th July, I telephone Adur District Council and spoke at length with "Abby" who I understand was a temporary Planning Officer following the retirement of Mr. Knight, and who visited the site. She advised me to write in to Adur's Planning Dept. detailing my objections and concerns and following that advice I wrote straight away.

I wrote to the Planning Dept. on 16th November objecting to the re-siting of the "shed" and asking for its complete removal as well as the existing concrete base. I enclose a copy of this letter as an attachment to this e-mail. Please would you kindly confirm by e-mail that you are in receipt of this letter.

Yours sincerely

Hilary Woodward

Dawn Ayres

From: Keith Morgan
Sent: 22 November 2010 08:39
To: Dawn Ayres
Cc: Peter Barnett
Subject: FW: ADC/0425/10 - Planning Objection
Attachments: Adur District Council 2010.11.20.doc; Adur District Council 2010.11.16.doc

---

From: Hilary Woodward [redacted]
Sent: 20 November 2010 14:26
To: Keith Morgan
Subject: ADC/0425/10 - Planning Objection

Dear Mr. Morgan
Please find two letters attached regarding my objections to the proposed developments at 51 Ullswater Road, Sompting.
Yours sincerely
Hilary Woodward

Planning Department
Adur District Council
Council Offices
Shoreham by Sea
East Sussex
BN43 6PR

47 Ullswater Road
Sompting
Lancing
West Sussex
BN15 9UG

Tuesday 16th November 2010

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application Objection: ADC/0425/10 - 51 Ullswater Road, Sompting BN15 9UG

I have been a co-owner of 47 Ullswater Road, Sompting since the 1970's, and wish to make objection to the plans for the re-siting of a "shed", submitted by Mr. Wheeler in respect of a neighbouring property on the following grounds:

1. Effect on Conservation Areas

Letters from the recently-retired, Mr. Knight (Adur District Council), dated 2004 state the land in question forms part of "a Site of Nature Conservation Importance, and is also within the Designated Strategic gap of countryside separating Sompting, Lancing, and Worthing – where new development will be strongly resisted."

It is incumbent upon the statutory organisations involved to be stewards and custodians in protecting the reed-bed habitat, which for decades has been a haven for wildlife, for the benefit of future generations.

Mr. Wheeler's plans show his massive workshop on this "protected" land, which breaches planning rules. Even if he moves his huge shed, he is proposing the existing massive concrete base (5.3 m x 3.65 m) will permanently remain on this land, widened further still by proposed railway sleepers etc.

In the comparatively short time he has been resident at 51 Ullswater Road, Mr. Wheeler's curtilage has sprouted an unsightly plethora of sheds and outbuildings, a variety of large brightly-coloured plastic objects, ceramic items e.g. a toilet bowl, metal items e.g. steel radiators. This accumulation of paraphernalia is out of character with that found in other properties in the area, and certainly is not the type of material which should be on "conservation" land. If Mr. Wheeler requires so many outbuildings to accommodate his belongings, he should have either purchased a larger property, or bought an individual property "in the sticks", or a more suitable location, where the construction of outbuildings would not have impinged upon the character of the neighbourhood, or affected neighbours.

[I understand that at one stage it was Mr. Wheeler's intention to attempt to circumvent the "protected" status of the land by asserting that the land had been used continuously as "garden" for more than 10 years. I can verify that this is most certainly not the case, and I present the "proof" below.

Prior to Mr. Wheeler purchasing the property on 22nd February 2008, 51 Ullswater Road was owned by Mr. S. Wraight, who purchased the bungalow on 1st November 2002, i.e. fewer than 10 years ago, the only garden attached to the property, was the original garden from 1959, i.e. that on the higher level. Thus none of the now highly-cluttered lower-level land was connected with 51 Ullswater Road, and the land was reed-bed. bed. Thus the land on which Mr. Wheeler has sited his unsightly outbuilding, has not been used continuously as "garden" in excess of 10 years. There is no question of adverse possession applying to any part of No. 51's property, as is clearly shown on the Land Registry map dated 29 Jan 2004, showing adverse possession land boundaries only on*

no's 37,39,43,47,49,53,57 & 61. Only when land was offered for sale in 2004, did Mr. Wraight purchase extra land. He did not apply for Planning Permission for change of use of this extra land for "garden" purposes.]

2. Design, appearance, character of proposed development

The huge outbuilding was erected without Planning Permission, contravening height and distance from adjoining boundary rules. As well as being erected on "conservation land" it is, out of character with the area by virtue of its massive dimensions. It is visible from quite a distance away, including from my property, detracts from the natural vista, and will be even more obtrusive if moved to the new proposed position, as it will be in closer proximity to our property, as well as quite possibly, a lot higher (see reasons below).

I presume Mr Wheeler's outbuilding exceeds the height limit because of the depth of the large concrete foundation upon which it rests. This platform is necessary because the land (being reed-bed, in parts below sea-level, as well as authorities never having required the water-courses to be cleared since pre-1959) floods several times a year. If moved, the foundations will need to be no less thick, and the outbuilding at no lower a level, in order to prevent the base of it flooding and rotting. On the diagram entitled "Front Elevation" the proposed foundations are brick rubble, sand and flagstones. According to the scale on the plan, the total height from the base of the brick rubble to the apex of the hut will be slightly in excess of 3.5 m i.e. – even higher than the current unacceptable height. The brick rubble, sand and flagstones are shown to be sunken below ground level. However, there would be no point in this as the base of the hut would still be at ground level, and subject to frequent flooding. Merely the outbuilding will not solve this problem. Removal of the apex and constructing a flat roof below the level of the existing wooden fence would obviate the visual problem to some degree.

I wish to point out some elements of Mr. Wheeler's drawings are misleadingly inaccurate.

<u>Diagram entitled "Aerial view of proposed shed"</u>
Misrepresentation of the width of the shed:
The hut is 3.4 m wide, yet on this plan at 0.5 m per unit square, only 6 squares are covered, i.e. 3 m – thus reducing the impression of the width by 0.4 m (approximately 16 inches).
Misrepresentation of the length of the shed:
It is stated the shed 4.8 m in length, yet on the plan, only the equivalent of 8 unit squares is covered, i.e. 4 m – thus again minimising the impression of the length, by 0.8 m (31.5 inches).

<u>Diagram entitled "Front Elevation"</u>
Misrepresentation of the width of the shed:
The hut is again 3.4 m wide, yet on the plan the width, according to the scale used is only 3 m, again reducing the impression of the width by 0.4m.

<u>Diagrams entitled "Side Elevation to 49 Ullswater Road, & "Side Elevation to 53 Ullswater Road"</u>
Misrepresentation of the length of the shed:
The shed is 4.8 m long, yet according to the scale employed appears to be only 4 m long, again misrepresenting the true size of the outbuilding by 0.8 m.

I request that, on this Site of Nature Conservation Importance, and Designated Strategic Gap of Countryside that Adur District Council reject the application for re-siting of the "shed" and that it, together with the existing concrete base, be removed altogether.

Yours faithfully