Sharon Leishman

From: Maureen Ashley [redacted]
Sent: 09 June 2013 18:36
To: Planning
Cc: Ben Stride
Subject: 3 Beach Road AWDM/0513/13
Attachments: 3 Beach Road, letter replying to James Appleton's letter.docx

Hello
Please see the attached response.
If it transpires that in fact you have received, or may shortly receive some re-amended plans from the architects, as described in my letter I would be grateful if you would allow me to amend the attached before uploading to your website. If there were such plans, that we were led to believe may follow, then our sentiments may be different. If there are none, I am happy for you to go ahead. I know this may be unusual but I am trying to respond within your 10 day guideline whilst the people next door are on holiday.

Maureen Ashley

3 Beach Road,; fao Matthew Porter, James Appleton. AWDM/0513/13

Hello

I write in response to Mr Appleton's letter dated 31 May and received 4th June.
These comments add to those previously submitted through the website. The most important point was the bricking up of our kitchen window.

On the day we received your letter, 4th June, I came in to the Civic Centre to see the amended plans. They appeared to be the same as those I saw on-line a week previous to this. The difference, and the only difference it seems, was the removal of the parapet wall. This meant that instead of bricking up all of our 1.6m wide kitchen window and beyond with a 2.95m high brick wall some 86cm away from it, there would be a 30cm sliver of un-bricked window left that, it has transpired, is intended to be fenced up instead of bricked up, with a 2m high fence.

On Sunday 2nd May, 2 days before the receipt of your letter but having already seen the amended plans on-line, we spoke to the people next door. They came round to our house at our invitation so that we could explain the impact of their plan from our perspective. There were sympathetic noises made and the parting message was one of a <we'll see if anything else can be done> sort of conclusion. As the sliver of remaining un-bricked window was discussed in this conversation it was assumed on both sides that we were talking about the amended plans and of therefore thinking of the 'anything else' as being beyond them. They also however described their intention to put up a 2m high fence up along the boundary anyway, so the amendment has made no difference to the effect on us.

When my husband went to invite them round they mentioned that they and their architect were doubtful that we had planning permission for our kitchen window anyway! The window is as on the original plans of our house from 1960. I found our plans to show them. I was surprised to see that on those plans their garage was not built on the boundary as it is now . There was more space originally between the houses. The coal bunker was not there either. I knew there had been an application to fill in the space between their garage and house with a carport in 1985. This was before both we and they moved in and before your electronic records. When I came in to the Civic Centre on Tuesday 4th June to check that in fact there were no hastily re-amended plans following our discussions on the Sunday, I also requested to see the plans and application for the 1985 project on 3 Beach Road. I have not, as yet, been told when I can see

these. I do not know how long it usually takes to retrieve these from where they are stored?

I hope that your 10 day response time can be extended to allow us to look at these plans and comment and that the plans can be retrieved as soon as possible?
The people next door left us with the strong impression that we would hear something more from them, as in the highlight above and also that they would be going on holiday this weekend, which indeed they have done, without saying anything more to us. I don't know if they have given any further instruction to their agent (their architects)? Is it possible for you to check please?

It also transpired in our conversation that I have mistakenly assumed for 20 years that our easterly boundary wall was our responsibility. It is not, it is theirs. We thus innocently attached a post to it at the north-western most corner of the plot last year and this seems to have annoyed them. I had thought that we at least had the few inches of the width of the low wall as breathing space --it appears we have not. We've offered to buy a slice of their land to give us some breathing space but they're not interested.

We feel very much squeezed in this plot. Number 3 is a much bigger site. We feel that something is being done to us that we don't like; it hurts and seemingly we can do nothing about it. That's a pretty good definition of bullying. It is wrong, whatever the rules are. We don't know what we've done to deserve being treated in this way, we can only think it's the post on the boundary wall. Our kitchen would be in the dark and we would need the lights on even when the sun is shining. Both we and they bought our houses with this problem. For our part we accepted it. We would have gone on accepting it. We have spent 20 years with a kitchen window with a very unsatisfactory outlook. But at least there has been an outlook. That is how we thought it would stay. We did not imagine at any point that anyone would think it acceptable to brick us in.

I have refrained in this letter from using the words neighbour or neighbourly. They imply a sense of equality, mutual co-existence and respect that seem lacking here. Of course there may be some re-amended plans on their way to you from their architects. I'm doubting it somehow. Please can you let us know? We can't ask people who are on holiday.

I was brought up in a back-to-back Coronation Street type of house in the north where the kitchen looked out onto a brick wall. The wall was a little more distant from the house than is intended here, but we had to have the

lights on all the time. If you allow this to go ahead you would be recreating those conditions in a detached house on the south coast for all future residents, not just us. It just doesn't fit with this area and it's wrong.

Maureen Ashley

(On behalf of Maureen and Lionel Ashley)