


Mrs R E Goddard
Oldbury Farm
Marsh Lane
Easthampnett
West Sussex
Chichester
PO18 0JW

1 May 2017

The Planning Department
Arundel District Council
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF



Dear Sir/ Madam

Objection to the Discharge of Conditions on the "Nyton Stables " development, (AL/23/17/DOC)

Over the past year, we have endured from this development blazing column lights and associated domestic lighting, penetrating the night where before there was darkness, and this has been a serious intrusion on the lives of ourselves and our neighbors in Marsh Lane. We have a complaint being dealt with at the moment regarding this, and the lack of adequate boundary landscaping that might afford us some protection.

Though there appeared to be lights all over the development, we were affected mostly perhaps by those of this earlier PP granted **(AL/10/14)** on the Western side of the development. My understanding is that this lighting is/was in **breach of the conditions** placed on this PP, where no lights should have been over **1mt** in height and placed on fencing, not on housing as they have been.

Added to this the full height column lights of which there appear to be several, not only lit the night sky but also the large white articulated lorries which in turn amplified and reflected the light back towards us.

This has also been very visible from the A27 and is referred to by some I believe as, "The Village"

I cannot express enough, how much better it has been with a reduction of this lighting in the past week or so, possibly due to some enforcement action. If the remaining lighting could be reduced to low level and discrete, then that would probably be acceptable.

It is on these grounds that we object to any further illuminations being discharged in this application **(AL/47/14/PL)** until this matter is addressed. Further lighting on this development will only make this matter worse.

Condition no.10.

Gate posts. Can we request that no lighting other than that which is absolutely necessary on any entrance is installed? A lantern style light on a gateway is high and not discrete. I see no reason why a single discrete gate light and perhaps an equally discrete porch light should not be adequate for visitors, emergency services, safety and security.

Chalets. I object rigorously to any wall lights at eaves level on all chalets, mobile homes and caravan walls, this has been one of the overriding problems for us because all it serves to do is light up the chalets for us to look at. It serves no purpose what so ever for the occupants of the chalets at night, it is a cosmetic application. Added to this the 800 lumens suggested is equivalent to about 70 watts I believe, several of these along a wall at eaves level is in my view extreme.

Out side, all that should be required is a porch light. Any lighting that illuminates these chalets/mobile homes or any other buildings and transportation should not be allowed.

Yard lighting. This is also one of the problems we have highlighted in our complaint. These lorries reflect and amplify any light shone directly on them. The ADC's recommendation is that floodlights should be avoided. Yet it is requested here that PIR triggered floodlights on poles under 3mtrs high, are installed.

A light installed on a pole 2.999m or even 2m in height, amounts too a column light, surely? So this lighting proposal goes against the ADC's recommendations.

To my knowledge this is not a work area, not at night anyway, the development is very private and difficult to access for any intruder, especially with guard dogs. I do not see that there should be a security problem or an access for emergency services problem over and above any other country property or Farm.

PIR triggered lights are inherently troublesome and we could have a situation where we have lights flashing on and off all night and the general light ambience it creates. There is no disclosure of the wattage of these lights either? I can appreciate that emergency lighting might be helpful in the case of a problem, but cannot see the necessity to use them for anything other than just that, an emergency.

Unnecessary lighting should be avoided in the country. Though we know that wild life adapts to these changes in urban situations, this is not urban but rural and the aim should be to minimize any intrusion on wild life and the Biodiversity wherever possible.

Conclusion We ask that our experience with this problem of highlighting vehicles and homes should be taken seriously because it causes unnecessary night intrusion for us and wild life. Why is there a need for constant lights, whether triggered or not, in stationary lorry bays or storage? I feel that

permission considered should start with the question; **"Is lighting actually essential in any particular one of these suggested applications"?** Rather than be approached from "how much lighting should be allowed".

I do ask, what ever is decided here, that it is remember that we need to protect our countryside from any kind of unnecessary change when those changes can be avoided, and that any lighting permitted is totally in keeping with the few properties in the immediate vicinity, which in this case is minimal. Also that thought is put into, how this may affect us the residence of Marsh Lane.

