

FORMAL OBJECTION

APP/18/00671 | Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission APP/15/00255 (2No. detached 3 bed houses (plots 3 & 4) with associated access and car parking) relating to additional block paving. | 6 Arun Close, Cowplain, Waterloo, PO8 8BP

Sovereign Developments AKA: The Builders

I write in regards to the above planning application and require this letter to act as my ***formal objection***.

I believe there are two matters relating to this application: the first to deal with the non-completion of the development and the second to deal with the application itself. I will therefore deal with the matters chronologically.

Non-Completion Of The Original Application

Visual Viewpoint

As I am sure you will appreciate, I purchased my property at a point in time when numbers 5,6, and 7 were not built and thus I saw the development from the plans. Whilst these plans have changed a number of times, the area around number 6 essentially, has not. From my point, it was important that the visual aspect of the development was pleasing to the eye and did not promote overcrowding. From looking at the plans, this was indeed, the case, with specific areas bricked for residents parking, visitors parking and for use as a roadway. Additionally, there were many areas of turf that again, provided a pleasing visual outlook.

Failure of the builder to complete the development as per the plans has adversely affected the visual development of the road.

I attach a photo taken within the last 7 days confirming that the area outside number 6 has not been completed by the Sovereign Developments in accordance with the planning application. The area has not been segregated into residents parking, turfed area or roadway as depicted by the colour of the bricks.

Visitors Parking

I, as well as other residents in Arun Close, were verbally informed by Sovereign Developments that the area opposite my property was for visitors parking. This is endorsed by the 'visitors parking' signs that were fitted to the area by the aforesaid Sovereign developments. Within the last 7 days however, I together with fellow residents have received a letter from Biscoe's solicitors advising me that the area was not visitors parking and is a turning area for emergency vehicles. I now note that the 'visitors parking' signs have been removed by the builders and replaced with a sign stating 'no parking turning area only'. This, in my opinion affects the usability of the community as originally detailed by the builder.

I attach photos of the two signs as discussed.

Planning Permission Sign Off

Due to the above, I am somewhat surprised that the development has been 'signed off' by the council, as the development has not been completed as per the final plans.

This has caused me concern and distress as the property I purchased in the development does not represent the visual aspect provided by the plans. Added to that, the issue over visitors parking has been a colophony of lies from the builder – a matter which has been proved by the installation, removal and re-installation of signs.

New Planning Application APP/18/00671

I am perplexed as to how a change as use application can be applied for when the original application has not yet been completed to the original plans.

I would like to confirm that neither I, or certain other residents have been written to by the council informing us of the planning application. Nor I hasten to add, have signs been placed in public view regarding the application.

The residents of number 6 Arun Close have been very vocal made their intentions for the area should permission be granted. They have stated that they intend to,

- Place 6' fence along the perimeter between the area and number 7 Arun Close
- Place gates between their boundary fence and the aforesaid fence on the perimeter with 7 Arun Close

As I have already stated, this would substantially impair the visual aspect of the development. It would also have a detrimental effect on the character of the development. In my opinion, this would be overbearing and out of proportion when taken in context with the development. This would turn the end of the road into an enclosed commune which will be visually damaging to the development.

This would have a significant impact on the value of all properties within Arun Close.

Additionally, it would further reduce, if not remove completely, the option for visitor parking at the end of the road.

Further, the road is currently owned by the builder, although with all residents having a right of acquiescence to their property. As such, I believe that any change of use in regards to a shared matter must have consent from each and everyone involved – something of which is not the case at present.

Summary

As already stated, I make formal objections to the following,

- Failure of the builder to complete the development according to the plans
- Formal objection to the planning application

Requirements

I require,

- The development to be completed as per the original plans
- The visitors parking issue to be resolved at the builders expense
- Planning permission refused

I would be pleased to discuss the points above in person.

Yours sincerely,