

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltrovers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk
Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning and click on Local Planning Application Find



From: Floyd Baker [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 July 2021 13:00
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Ref: AL/81/21/PL Ryefields Farmhouse

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.

Planning Ref: AL/81/21/PL

Objection to the above planning application, Ryefields Farmhouse, Woodgate.

Being residents of Oak Tree Lane we would firstly we would like to state that the site does not lend itself to current Building Regs., Part B Fire Safety: Approved Document B – Volume 1 Dwellings; Requirements B - Access and Facilities for Fire Service. Table 13.1. The sites entrance is only accessed via private lanes, within what is known as Reeds Lane, an unmade up track that is only 3 metres wide before the access to the site. It does not meet current building regulations for the access for fire services in the event of an emergency.

As for their swept path analysis for 'larger' refuse trucks; it seems that you'd have to take pot luck whether it manages the turn in perfectly on first try, or you'll end up with them driving over or into some of the landscaping,

not to mention going into the hedge on the opposite side of the lane! Currently the larger refuse truck can't access the Reeds Lane end and a smaller truck has to come to collect refuse from there on, which would include any refuse from new additions on site.

Regarding the plans for drainage: Southern Water Section 106, requires permission of the landowner before works can be carried out, and I quote - "If you need to cross third-party land or connect to a private sewer in order to make the connection, you must first get the written permission from the land or sewer owner. We can't give you permission to work in third party land through our approval for the connection." The plans show foul water (sewage) and surface water rising mains mapped as being installed along Reeds Lane and Oak Tree Lane. They haven't sought and don't have permission to dig up the lane/s and this also raises the question of access to the Woodgate Centre and residents at the far end of Oak Tree Lane, if such work were to go ahead, without permission, as it would affectively block the whole lane for the duration of the installation, stopping business vehicles and residents from driving onto their own properties. Again though, NO PERMISSION HAS BEEN GRANTED! This goes against the requirements of Southern Water.

Regarding gas supply: I quote the National Grid's requirements: "Grantors (landowners and occupiers) - Most gas transmission apparatuses (such as pipelines) is on or under third-party land. Before we can install and operate gas assets on land we do not own, we require rights from the owner or occupier of that land. These landowners are known as grantors and we are committed to maintaining a successful working relationship with them." Again, the developer does not have permission.

Regarding electricity – Quoting the National Grid again – "Easements and wayleaves - To install and operate electricity equipment, such as overhead lines, pylons or underground cables, on land that we do not own, we require the rights to do so from the landowner or occupier. A wayleave or easement agreement with the landowner or occupier gives us the rights to install, access, maintain and repair our equipment on their land." Again, no permission has been sought or granted.

As per previous correspondence, regarding this site, access is via private lanes, these are owned by not one, but two different owners, neither of which have given permission for its use as an access to new additional housing. These would be constituted as 'new additions' and are not covered in the agreement with the owner of Ryefields Farmhouse. This point seems to be blatantly overlooked by the application as it only briefly mentions the site is accessed by a private road in one document, but omits the point the they don't have permission (easement) to do so.

This point was also overlooked when filling out the application for planning: Part 8. Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way. Last question: Do the proposals require any diversions/extinguishments and/or creation of rights of way? Answer: No. - It should've been yes. The developer, and, if planning was granted, subsequent owners of the new houses would have no right to access their property via the lane. No easement / right of way along Oak Tree Lane or Reeds Lane (effectively the track part) have been sought or granted for the new additions. I'm sure houses without easement would be tough to sell once built; any good solicitor would warn any prospective buyers of such a clause. On this point alone the site should never be granted planning permission, with access via Oak Tree Lane, or it would set a dangerous precedence for all private land owners if developers get permission to access land they don't own or have easement rights over.

A quick interjection; how can they have plans to "Remove" two Oak trees (Numbers T20 & T29), a Silver Birch (T05) and a Hawthorne (T30) that is on someone else's land? Or, as they put it, "...just off site..." !!!

As for the 'new' footpath, that they claim 'ties in' to the existing one - It doesn't. It would have to straddle the gated entrance to the land next to the site and a little further beyond it in order to do so. There is a total disconnect between the two. At some point pedestrians would have to walk/traverse an unmade up section in order to reach the next path.

As well as the designs not being in keeping with the area, the need for 3 and 4 bed houses is out of step with current requirements where 1 and 2 bed houses for the younger generation are needed. Family houses would also usually need access to local schools and doctors, both of which are currently vastly oversubscribed.

Also the TRICS assessment is way out of date. There are vehicles in and out of the lane to the Woodgate Centre and households all day long.

Going forward, if access is required it would make a great deal of sense for this site to be accessed or integrated with the proposed Pye Homes site. Their plans already show a vehicle access way already facing this site into an extra parking area and their plot butts right up against this site, but will be accessed via the relief road, and not via a private lane, that incurs private maintenance funding. This, to us, is a sensible way forward.

On a side note, what is the point of the photoboard? The first three photos are not taken from the points they have suggested on the map. All three were not taken from the turnaround/turning circle at the end of Oak Tree Lane, but instead taken in different directions from the same gate entrance, which incidentally does not lead to the sites entrance, but to a slip of land to the side of it.

This application lacks consistency and is full of flaws including not fulfilling the various utilities requirements, those of health and safety of the emergency services and that easement over private land has not been granted.

Yours Faithfully,

Floyd & Elaine Baker