

Objections raised by David and Tracy Hodges, residents of 2 Park Farm Cottage, Hook Lane, Aldingbourne PO20 3TQ

15th May 2025

We are the residents immediately adjacent to the proposed site for new dwelling houses, next to the proposed entrance/exit to the 2 properties. We are established residents and have lived at this property for 17 years.

We strongly object to the plans as currently submitted, and the proposal generally, and had we had an opportunity to vote at the public meeting on Tuesday, we would both have objected to the plans, as submitted.

We have only been made aware of this planning application a couple of week ago when the sign appeared on the post outside of our house. We have only had time to take look at the plans and a cursory glance over the other documents. We have spotted a few inaccuracies. In view of this, and the potential impact upon us, we would like to request an extension of 2 weeks to properly look at (more thoroughly) the extensive documents submitted online to date with this application.

Our main objections relate to the access position and its impact, due to the limitations of the site and the proposed number of properties/vehicles, the increased flooding impact and the impact on the wildlife (in that order of priority), as well as some other issues.

From a quick glance at the documents submitted, there are a number of inaccuracies and concerns, which we will outline here.

Proposed entrance/exit

We have looked at the plans, which are both misleading and inaccurate for the following reasons:

- The plans show that the 2 cottages adjacent to the application site are of equal size. This is incorrect; these properties are identical. This raises concerns about the accuracy of the other information in the plans.





- The application states that the location of the entrance/exit to the site is to stay the same, however the position of the entrance/exit in the plans appears to be further into the corner, towards the road. The entrance/exit, in its current position, would require more of a u-turn manoeuvre to turn right.

The first photo on the left shows the approach to the site on the left, with very obscured view. The second photo shows that vehicles turning right need to make a u-turn.

- The way in which the plans are presented, do not adequately demonstrate the bend in the road. Almost every winter there is ice on the road bend and every year, without fail, we have witnessed at least one vehicle ending up in the ditch opposite the current gate of the proposed site (by the traffic cone), requiring a recovery vehicle.



- The plans submitted provide an example of 2 cars in the layby next to the proposed site. This is highly misrepresentative. Each of the 2 houses adjacent to the site has 3 bedrooms and 2 car parking spaces. We currently have 2 cars. The photograph in the submission was taken at a time when there were only 2 cars outside of both properties, ie 1 outside each house, and all of the plans show only 2 cars in the diagrams. The photograph here on the right shows one of the 2 parking spaces occupied outside of 2 Park Farm Cottages and the small space for the second car. Just to clarify, there are usually 3 or 4 cars parked outside of these two cottages every evening.



- The plans show a clear access route into the proposed parking area. This photo shows the angle directly looking into the proposed access, with our car parked as close to our gate as possible.
- The plans show that service vehicles, eg postal, shopping, delivery services, must have available access via the entrance to the site. In reality, these vehicles would use the layby to temporarily park while attending to these services. This would directly impact the current users of the layby, as having access to further properties with 6 bedrooms would double the volume of deliveries and visitors parking in the layby. Further, there are frequently times where the current residents are using all 4 spaces allotted to them, requiring their visitors to park across and block the proposed access. This has not been a problem in the past, because the site has been infrequently used by

non-residents, who worked full-time. This could create an issue if there were 4 additional cars, plus visiting vehicles needing access. More on this below.

The use of the layby has been highly understated in the submission. This layby currently already services the following users regularly:

1. As mentioned above, the adjacent 2 properties have 6 bedrooms between them. There are usually 4 vehicles, not 2 as described in the plans.
2. The 2 adjacent properties have regular visitors who use this layby to park, sometimes requiring them to park across the front of the cars to squeeze in.
3. Frequent service vehicles, eg post, grocery shopping and delivery services.
4. The refuse collection services (general refuse, brown waste and recycling) use this layby to gather and collect bins for the at least 3 properties in the immediate vicinity (1 Park Farm Cottages, 2 Park Farm Cottages and Catherine's Cottage opposite).
5. The two cottages adjacent to the site do not have mains sewerage (or gas) and the layby is used by the waste disposal vehicle.

6. The field across the road has horses in it. A tractor regularly uses the layby to position itself opposite the gate to deliver bales of hay to the field opposite to access it. The first photo on the right shows where the tractor enters the layby from the farm land with the loaded bails of hay, and the second photo shows the gate to the horses opposite, that the tractor goes through after positioning itself in the layby.



7. The owners of the horses attend to their horses at least once a day. They either park their cars in the layby, or on the corner where the traffic cone is located in the earlier photograph.
8. The owners of the horses use the layby for farriers and to have the space to position a horse box when needed.
9. The owners of the horses use the layby to mount their horses when riding.
10. Hook Lane is a long, narrow road, winding road and vehicles, particularly large vehicles, do not have many/sufficient passing places at this end. The layby is often used as a passing place.

11. Passing delivery vans (not servicing the properties in the layby) use the layby to check their stops and/or to turn around. This happens frequently because many of the properties in Hook Lane have house names, rather than numbers.

The impact on the current residents and the layby has been hugely understated. We strongly object to the location of the site entrance/exit (or any entrance to the land that utilises the layby for residential properties). If two 3 bedroom properties are built on the site, as proposed with access in this position, this would double the impact on points 2, 3, 4 and possibly 5 for all current users of the layby, which is already very busy.

Proposed resolutions

1. Permission for this planning application is refused;
2. or:
 - a. we, as immediate neighbouring residents adjacent to the proposed access point, would be less opposed to an application submitted for the development of one, rather than two dwelling houses, as this would reduce the impact of access issues outlined above, subject to the resolution of other issues raised below; and
 - b. would be less opposed to an application submitted if the proposed access was on the straight/north side of the plot, ie access via the road, not via the current gate and layby, subject to the resolution of other issues raised.

Impact on existing flooding issue

As stated, we have resided at the adjacent property for 17 years and throughout this period we have experienced flooding in both the back garden and via the layby at the front.

This is caused by a large, gradual slope in the field behind the site, whereby water channels into the corner situated around the site and our back garden.

Despite any data recorded, this is a frequent and ongoing issue. We have photographs of our dog when she was a puppy standing in our back garden deep in the water. This was over 12 years ago and the issue is ongoing. Every time there is heavy rain we experience flooding in the garden at the back.

At the front, we often experience flooding as well. The water pools in the field behind the site and then spills into the site and flows out of the gate and into the layby.

The site currently largely consists of grass soakaway. If one or two properties are built on this site, then this will significantly reduce the natural soakaway, as there would be large area built on for the properties. The proposed parking area on the site would likely need a hardstanding. Both of these factors would divert the water further towards our house and the layby at the front.

This would impact and exacerbate the flooding issue that we currently experience on a frequent basis and potentially undermine the structure of the cottages.

Proposed resolutions

1. Permission for this planning application is refused;
2. or:
 - a. we, as immediate neighbouring residents adjacent to the proposed access point, would be less opposed to an application submitted for the development of one, rather than two dwelling houses, as this would reduce the flooding issues outlined above, subject to the resolution of other issues raised below; and
 - b. would be less opposed to an application submitted, if adequate drainage solutions were implemented to ensure that the current flooding issue is properly resolved and not further exacerbated by pushing the flooding problem further towards our home.

Impact on internet services

This is a secondary issue, but a serious concern nonetheless. Two of the residents in the neighbouring properties work from home. We do not have fibre optics and the internet service is already very poor.

Proposed resolution

We, as immediate neighbouring residents adjacent to the proposed access point, would be less opposed to an application submitted, if there was a fibre optics broadband service.

General impact

This is a beautiful, rural area that is a peaceful home to wildlife and one of the reasons we have lived here for so long and intend to continue to do so. We would rather that the land remained as it is and we are concerned that having property(ies) and garage(s) adjacent to where we live will have an impact on the wildlife and us generally, as this would mean that we are potentially overlooked and/or have a view of cars/garages, changes would be needed to the boundary, which would be likely to be less natural, there would be an increase in noise levels and inconvenience and changes to the highway, such as any need for lighting, road markings or signage, would combine to significantly change and impact the enjoyment of our home.

Proposed resolution

We would be less likely to object to changes to the use of this land if provision is made to eliminate, or minimise significantly, any potential impact it would have on us and our surrounding neighbours.

Impact on wildlife

When assessing the impact on wildlife in the area due to the proposed change of use, the report inaccurately states that the site is “in constant use, likely deterring bat use”. This is inaccurate. The site is not in constant use. For at least as long as we have lived in the neighbouring property (17 years), the site has been used by hobbyists who both worked full-time elsewhere. Yes, there were always vehicles on the site, but nature is left to itself most of the time, so the use of this phrase is inaccurate at least and misleading at worst.

Proposed resolution

1. This is a lengthy report and we would like the opportunity to read it properly.
2. We do have bats who are usually visible at dusk on a warm evening and my son often finds newts and slow worms in our garden. Whatever is decided about this plot of land, due consideration must be given to the potential impact on the wildlife on this site.
3. We would invite that the report is reviewed by the writers and the potential implications and recommendations reconsidered in light of the confirmed bat and newt activity.

Archaeological significance

As requested above, we would like an extension to the deadline for comment, as we have not had sufficient opportunity to read all of the plans and lengthy documents submitted relating to this application.

We are aware of the archaeological significance in this area, as outlined in Sussex Archaeological Collections Volume 161 dated 2023, which states that excavation at Hook Lane, Westergate, uncovered an Iron Age rural settlement on the West Sussex coastal plain. Between 2015 and 2017 Archaeological South East carried out an evaluation followed by an excavation of land at Hook lane, West Sussex, and encountered multiple phases of prehistoric activity.

Proposed resolution

1. This is a lengthy report and we would like the opportunity to read it properly.
2. We request that the archaeological submission is reviewed in light of the findings of archaeological significance in Hook Lane.

Conclusion

If our concerns are not addressed and resolved (particularly relating to the issues of access and flooding), we will have no alternative but to strongly oppose any applications (as a whole) for the building of any property on the site.

This part of Hook Lane is narrow and bendy. Flooding on this part of the lane in particular, continues to be a problem and in winter it is often dangerous with sheets of ice across this windy road.

It is important to note that the original site was a part of the garden to 1 Elm Cottage, at a time when the area was more rural, the lane was less built up and the layby was less busy. The use of this gate and the impact of its use to the residents in 1 and 2 Park Farm Cottage has, to date, been minimal. The site of this gate (next to the layby), is not suitable for access to 2 further homes with 6 bedrooms.

David and Tracy Hodges

of 2 Park Farm Cottages, Hook Lane, Aldingbourne PO20 3TQ







15th May 2025

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notifications of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



Our priorities...

 <p>Improving the wellbeing of Arun</p>	 <p>Delivering the right homes in the right places</p>	 <p>Supporting our environment to support us</p>	 <p>Fulfilling Arun's economic potential</p>	 
--	---	---	--	--

From: Dave Hodges [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 May 2025 15:34
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application AL/30/25/OUT / Our comment reference OWPC76534

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

