WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED 28 JUN 2012
On Comp | In Report
Addm | Post Addm.

MP.

1 The Tynings
Lancing
West Sussex
BN15 8PW

22 June 2012

Adur & Worthing Councils
Planning Services
Portland House
Richmond Road
Worthing, West Sussex
BN11 1LF

Dear Sirs

AWDM/0636/12 – Retrospective application for fencing and gate to western side of 10 Finches Close, Lancing

Thank you for your letter of 14 June. I have owned and occupied 1 The Tynings, Lancing since 1980 and have, since that time, seen changes at 10 Finches Close. You will no doubt hold a plan which shows the location of my property in relation to the subject. The application seems straightforward, but relevant to it are some historic issues.

In 1980, 10 Finches Close was owner occupied and had small rectangular front and rear gardens. The area adjacent to the property and to the west was part of the open-plan nature of The Tynings. Since the original occupiers moved some years later, the property has changed hands three times. The "open plan" area was enclosed by one occupier, with fencing and hedging, and many of us in The Tynings were most unhappy that this situation was an infringement and also led to a "blind corner" – a potentially dangerous situation with traffic coming in and out of the close. Solicitors were contacted but all protestations proved ineffective. Is there no way that, retrospectively, this can now be investigated?

Worthing Homes eventually purchased 10 Finches Close and let it out. The situation with the high hedge was still dangerous, and in this respect I had concern that any collision could result in a vehicle ending up in my front garden. I have therefore viewed with some interest what has now developed.

Rather than putting the land back into its original state / purpose as we had all hoped, Worthing Homes proceeded to provide their tenant with a full side garden for the safe enclosure of the family and numerous animals. There is now a hedge which is shorter in length than the original, together with a quarter circle area of stoning and paving to the front /west, which I do feel has enhanced the appearance of the dwelling. The tenant, with whom I would stress I have a cordial relationship, has improved the front garden with suitable planting and, as a non-car owner, I felt that in general the works were acceptable.

The issue with the fencing and gate I think is that of height and there are still concerns for pedestrian / traffic safety/ vision in relation to this new application. Might it be appropriate for a planning officer to visit the site during "rush hour" time rather than the department merely rubber-stamping this application?

I trust my comments have been of assistance and, although you mention that in respect of this application itself, letters will not be formally acknowledged, going back to my comments in paragraph two I should be very interested indeed to learn how sections of an "open plan" estate on which I purchased my house in good faith can have been enclosed with the apparent acquiescence of the local authority and with no reference to nor consultation with the property owners.

Yours faithfully

[redacted]

Jean Whale (Mrs)