

29.08.17

Mr. David Easton.
Re. FG/115/17/PL.

ADC. Planning App.

Please place my current objection with
photos on the public portal for the above
application, closing date 31st August 2017.
Previous letters/copies of objection are for
your ease of reference only and not necessary
to reproduce again on the current application.

Many Thanks



Mr EA Hutchings
42 Ferringham Lane
Ferring
WORTHING
BN12 5LU

Scanned
with
BritishRedCross



E. A. Hutchings, 42 Ferringham Lane, Ferring, West Sussex. BN12 5LU

Arun District Council
Attn. Mr. D. Easton, (Planning dept.)
Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
Sussex

26.08.17

Dear Mr. Easton,

Ref: Planning Application No. FG/115/17/PL
(re-submission of FG/196/15/OUT and FG/69/16/OUT)

*Current
Objection*

I refer to my previous letters of objection regarding the subsequent withdrawal and re-submission with alterations of proposed plans, Ref. OWPC 7785, and the manual submission P55 of 10/03/16) and the verbal representation made on my behalf at the development control meeting 13th. Jul 2016 by Mr. William Harvey.

This together with my objection made on the Government appeal website for the outline planning consent, form the basis of my objection.

I enclose copies of all previous objections from myself for your reconsideration and would add the following objections to the latest application.

The Appeal Decision (appeal ref. APP/C3810/W17/3166634) made by Joanna Reid BA (Hons) BArch(Hons)RIBA of the Planning Inspectorate has since given outline planning consent to four, 3 bed bungalows (application ref. FG/69/16/OUT)

However the consent clearly states in paragraph 1. the following:-

"THE APPEAL IS ALLOWED in accordance with the terms of the application FG/69/16/OUT SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS SET OUT IN SCHEDULE A.

Briefly, these key advisory conditons in Schedule A, are as follows:-

(as Mr. Ian Hayward of CCD Planning Consultations has pointed out in his letter of 21st. August to Arun District Council):

5. **NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE** until the **4M WIDE** shared surface access has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans.
6. **NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE** until details of the traffic light system is submitted and approved.
The approved traffic light system **SHALL THEREAFTER BE MAINTAINED IN OPERATIONAL ORDER** as approved.
7. **NO DWELLING SHALL BE FIRST OCCUPIED UNTIL VISIBILITY SPLAYS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED**, and these splays shall be maintained and **KEPT FREE OF OBSTRUCTIONS MORE THAN .6M HIGH** above the level of the adjoining carriageway.

8. **NO DWELLING SHALL BE INHABITED** until parking spaces, garages and turning spaces shown on approved plans have been constructed and approved by the LPA, and the parking spaces, turning facilities, garages and visitor parking spaces shall **NOT HEREAFTER BE USED FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN THE PARKING, TURNING AND GARAGING OF VEHICLES.**

I am assured these conditions are to be complied with.

The Outline Appeal was granted for **BUNGALOWS**.
TWO STOREY HOUSES are now being applied for.

The Plan has changed.

The developer, initially promoted the scheme as retirement bungalows on a door to door basis to drum up letters of support in the locality and further afield, a successful ploy that generated a Development Control Meeting on July 13th. 2016 and a subsequent Appeal for Outline planning consent which has now been conditionally granted.

I understand that despite all the objections including those of the Ferring Parish Council, Arun District Council support the development. But I fail to see how it can be approved by the LPA without meeting the conditions outlined by the Government Planning Inspectorate, who recognised **ACCESS** as the **MAIN ISSUE.**

Should this ammended application achieve further conditional approval my concerns are as follows:

1. **Inadequate on site parking**

The designated parking is insufficient, the current occupants have 3 vehicles.

There is nothing to suggest each new house will have less, nor will there be any way of forcing residents to use their garages (as required by the Inspectorate conditions) solely for vehicle parking. The current provision is for 2 vehicles (one garaged and one on hard standing) for each dwelling. There is provision for only 3 visitor bays on the site.

I have no doubt this will lead to on street parking along Ferringham Lane.

3. **Traffic Light System**

Vehicles wishing to enter the site will be stationary in Ferringham Lane awaiting a green light (lights, that will be positioned somewhere within the entrance itself, that they may not even be able to see). If coming from the North, all vehicles, irrespective of size will be positioned on the wrong side of the carriageway in order to make the turn into the narrow entrance. Dependant on their size and length, may find they are unable to enter at all due to the width available and be forced to reverse in the middle of the highway. If the private traffic light system is not visible or is malfunctioning it will also cause vehicles to reverse back out into busy lane.

4. **Speed Limit**

The Planning Inspectorate granted Outline Consent on the basis of a 20mph. speed limit along Ferringham Lane. At the time of this appeal the limit had already been raised to 30mph. with the 20mph roundels painted out. No advisory Speed Signs have been replaced and I have visited the Parish Council several times to ask why, as many drivers are now going in excess of this limit. With the addition of on street parked cars this would make entry and exit perilous for ALL road users.

5. **Neighbouring Access Entrances/Exits**

With three driveways of 46,44 and 42 in a line, there is no visibility splay available to the site that

can reasonably be maintained. Who would keep the "visibility splays unobstructed hereafter" as decreed by the Planning Inspectorate in their Condition 7 of the consent decision? Myself and all adjacent properties and those opposite will have future problems entering and leaving our properties if the development succeeds. (see photo below).

PHOTO OF THE THREE ENTRANCES AT 42, 44 & 46 FERRINGHAM LANE

6. **Pedestrian Safety**

As the **only pedestrian access into and out of the site** the Inspectorate has specified a 4 metre shared surface access construction before any development takes place.

At present it is 3.63m which translates into the 12ft. strip of land that was originally part of my plot till 1954. Since then the boundary has stood as is.

When 4m is achieved, the inspectorate considers the access will be able to accommodate a large goods vehicle and a pedestrian pushing a buggy. (see recent photo of small goods vehicle/super market delivery truck in existing access).

PHOTO OF DELIVERY TRUCK IN CURRENT ACCESS

Even with the extra 0.4 of a metre I would seriously question the safety of walking with a young child and pushing a pram, cycling a bike or with a dog on a lead, past a heavy goods vehicle along the 60mt drive.

The photo illustrates the protrusion of the wing mirrors on this smaller lorry. Imagine the size of those on an HGV and the extra width.

When the pedestrians have reached the exit they will then have to contend with crossing over the lane, to the only pavement on the other side, amidst parked vehicles, vehicles waiting to enter or depart this site and those of neighbouring driveways, together with the normal process of just simply looking left or right for the normal flow of oncoming traffic.

As this proposed application continues to gain momentum, I doubt it will cease to be applied for in one form or another, and the stressful situation will continue. Having already received a solicitors letter and been threatened with police action, by the developer, for replacing fencing and dead boundary hedges to retain my security and privacy, it is not a pleasant prospect for my family.

If approved, this application will force the re-configuration of the driveway, entrance and exit to my property in an attempt to avoid the problems that I have herein anticipated. Possibly requiring the need to remove more mature trees, shrubs and wildlife habitat that I have worked to preserve during the 26yrs. of my residence.

E. A. Hutchings

E. A. Hutchings, 42 Ferringham Lane, Ferring, West Sussex. BN12 5LU

Arun District Council
Attn. Mr. D. Easton, (Planning dept.)
Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
Sussex

22.05.16

Dear Mr. Easton,

Ref: Planning Application No. FG/69/16/OUT (re-submission of FG/196/15/OUT)

I refer to my two previous letters of objection regarding the subsequent withdrawal and re-submission with alterations of proposed plans, (Ref. OWPC 7785, and the manual submission P55 of 10/03/16). I repeat the latter in its entirety below as my objections have not altered.

Following on from this are further points I would like to raise, to include both hard copies and photographic supporting material supplied in person herewith, that I respectfully request your office display or download as necessary with this letter of objection.

Many thanks

E. A. Hutchings

*Previous
Objection
letters.*

11.03.16

For the attention of Mr.D.Easton
Re: Planning Reference3 FG/196/15/OUT

(AGAINST)

Dear Sir,

In response to the minor revisions, amended plans and traffic data re-submitted by the applicant, I would refer you to my previous letter of objection (Ref. OWPC7785) and the comments made therein, which remain the same. In addition I would like make the following remarks in light of recent developments and information.

ACCESS:

1. The applicant now claims a 4m wide access, based on a dated Ordinance Survey Map, which clearly does not reflect the situation on the ground. Having personally measured the access that runs between my property and No.46 Ferringham Lane, wall to wall/larch-lap fence to metal wire post which demarcate the boundary along its entirety, this shows a maximum width of only 3.63m. The required 4.8m narrowing to 4.1 (as required by WSCC, see Ian Hayward's letter dated 23.12.15 refers) cannot be achieved. These boundaries have stood for 30 years or more and any attempt by the Applicant to redraw his boundaries will result in litigation.
2. The stated splays are neither accurate or achievable. A section of wall (now reinstated) was removed without permission to enhance the application. If Buses are waiting outside or vehicles are parked either side of the exit, which they inevitably will be as No.42 and 46 own the private road up to the middle of the carriageway, it is simply not possible to exit safely under normal conditons and "splay" becomes a redundant issue. I have first hand experience of this eventuality and always 'see' my visitors with cars out of my drive, and similarly my family do the same for each other regularly. If there is a vehicle parked opposite, the manoeuvre also requires some reversing (and would prove impossible for a lorry,) both difficult and dangerous with traffic on both northbound and southbound lanes approaching at unpredictable speeds (a request to have a 20mph limit in the villages has recently been rejected).
3. The applicant has suggested parallels between his proposed access and those of Lavender Court, a block of 4 flats two doors down in Ferringham Lane. A very poor comparison for the following reasons:
 - (a) Their narrow access road services only a small compound of 4 single garages, measuring 3.1m, this private right of way is owned by two of the residents allowing garage access only to the other two flats.
 - (b) The access is not required for use by emergency vehicles, deliveries or visitors.
 - (c) Whilst being both vehicular and pedestrian, it is only one of several alternative pedestrian options.

As you can see there is no comparison to the proposed single shared access to No.44, which would provide the sole, unrestricted access to 4 bungalows and one large house, thus used by a considerably higher volume of both pedestrians and vehicles, visitors, delivery vans, refuse collection and emergency services etc. There is no room for a separate paved area and street lights are not permitted in South Ferring so a danger to pedestrians, cyclists, mothers with prams, mobility vehicles etc. is clear. Indeed the proposed traffic light system is only for vehicle control and does nothing to address the high possibility of vehicle/pedestrian conflict in what amounts to a long, narrow, unlit passage throughout which there is simply not enough room for vehicles and pedestrians/other road users to safely pass one another.

PARKING/TRAFFIC:

Lavender Court can be used to illustrate inadequate parking provisions made for the proposed development.

1. Lavender Court parking provisions for the 4 x two bedroomed flats are a single garage and one parking space per flat and whilst the flats were owned by retired folk this arrangement worked well. However some flats are now occupied by younger working people, some with three vehicles, now using land at the front, previously garden, for off road parking and causing the loss of 'on street' visitor parking now forced further along the lane outside other properties.
2. At 44 the provisions are the same for the 4 x three bedroomed bungalows, a single garage and one parking space each, when they could, in reality, have 4 cars/vans per household, not to mention visitors. This would doubtless cause overflow parking along Ferringham Lane too.
3. As mentioned, Ferring has a private roads system and house owners own the roads immediately outside their properties up to the middle of the road and pay maintenance subscriptions to Ferring Roads Scheme Association. Overflow parking onto Ferringham Lane generated by this development is therefore not an option, thus the proposed parking arrangements are inadequate.
4. It is clear to me, a long term resident, that on street parking in Ferring in general, and Ferringham Lane in particular, has easily doubled in recent years, due to the loss of off-road parking caused by overdevelopment of sites, extensions, building on former garage compounds etc. This project will undoubtedly add to the traffic flows and lead to more on street parking. Even though we consider ourselves lucky that Ferring does not have a major through road, the village roads, once pretty and scenic are fast becoming ugly parking lots and the traffic more congested. Bearing in mind we have, for the most part, no pavements or street lighting, they are also becoming increasingly less safe for pedestrians and our children. The precedent set by granting permission for this kind of development to proceed will be seized by others, ultimately leading to the erosion of the quiet village life with increasing vehicular traffic and detriment to both safety and amenity of villagers.

NOISE/LIGHT

1. The development will result in additional noise generated by 4 extra families, driving 4-5 vehicles per hour at peak times i.e. one every quarter of an hour, along two boundaries of my property. Previously there would have been at most one or two, twice a day, and certainly none at night. Pedestrians too were rare, with the exception of the postman, I have been used to my house being in a quiet position, set back from the road, not surrounded on three sides. My privacy and amenity will effectively be destroyed by this development.
2. There will be a huge increase in light pollution from both vehicles and pedestrians (at night using torches) and the proposed traffic light system. Vehicular movements could occur throughout the night and headlights will shine into my house at the front, side and rear, where once it was effectively in total darkness most of the time. Together with domestic and security lights this will cause immense disturbance and completely change the character of my home, more akin to living in a town street than a semi-rural village lane. Again, this development will destroy my privacy and amenity.

WILDLIFE:

Already, the removal of so many trees by the applicant, without a care for the environment, has had a negative impact on wildlife in the area, located as it is in the heart of the village, adjacent to the Little Paddocks area of special interest. Please imagine the further effect on wildlife in this semi-rural spot, albeit already despoiled in pursuit of this application, when the diggers and earth movers get to work, pheasants, ducks and moorhens from the nearby pond in Little Paddocks, nesting woodpeckers, owls, wrens, blackbirds, robins, blue tits, toads and hedgehogs at the bats at night etc. etc.

Approval of this development will further destroy the habitats of this wildlife and affect those in the immediate vicinity.

THE APPLICANT

1. Mr. Cornell is not a local, and has made little attempt to engage with villagers most affected by his plans. He purchased Paddock House, not to settle in the village, but to sell it on at a profit and has, in the process caused stress to myself and my family, friends and neighbours.
2. Having removed the mature trees that enhanced the property (before submitting his initial application) he has recently planted what he calls a 'screen' of leylandi spanning 40ft. at the bottom of my garden, his side, but virtually on top of the existing privet hedge that divides our two properties. Now desperate to restore privacy to Paddock House which he currently has on the market, it is ironic the Estate Agents appear to be using photos of the gardens as they once were complete with trees (that previously kept it so private) taken before he systematically cut them down claiming they were rotten and diseased.
3. I offered to supply and plant more manageable trees than leylandi, at my own expense. The offer was declined despite the fact that I will still be here to watch them grow out of hand while he has moved on to his next deal. It has historically always been difficult to get the previous owners of 44 to trim the hedges, what chance of then getting 6 owners to agree maintenance of the boundary hedge when it becomes communal? Despite 'High Hedges' legislation, actually getting something done is a well known, tortuous process therefore having trimmed the privet hedge myself twice yearly since 1991 to keep it in check AND at the legal maximum height for this very reason, I only have to look out my window at the same hedge running behind Lavender Court garages to remind myself how it would look had I not done so, am I now to watch a screen of leylandi take over? In sum, why should a developer be able to come in and cause all this damage and distress for longterm residents?
4. Having seen the level of opposition to the initial application, members of the applicants family went about 'cold calling' on nearby residents (and some in Goring?) to obtain letters of support, claiming the development was for retirement bungalows. The various, hand written, letters seem to confirm this, and also that their boundary hedges would also now be kept in check. I have it directly from Mr Cornell that there is no restriction on the age of would be purchasers. I have already covered the likelihood of getting the boundary hedges regularly cut.

CONCLUSION

If permission is granted for such developments, that will do nothing to solve the nationwide housing problem, the quality of village life across the county, indeed the whole country, will, slowly but surely be eroded, changed forever, a precedent will have been set. Once idyllic villages, rural or semi-rural communities will become a thing of the past, replaced by noisy and polluting, back-built overdevelopment, increased traffic, poor access, on street parking, traffic control, loss of wildlife etc. not to mention the effect on the water table/flooding as gardens and green spaces are concreted over and lost forever.

Please consider carefully all my above objections, those submitted now and previously by other concerned villagers and the Parish Council.

Whilst some may be considered irrelevant purely in planning terms, your decision on this application will affect real lives, mine and my family's, friends and neighbours, Ferring villagers alike, now and in the future, and as the person whose property will probably be most affected by this proposed development, I stand to lose all of the most important things we have enjoyed about living here for more than a quarter of a century. This is about our village, our home, our life and our future. I strongly urge you to reject this application

As of 23rd. May 2016 - I now have further points I would like to raise, documentation and photographs to further support my objection:

ACCESS

The Strutt and Parker Planning Design and Access Statement, states:-

The access will be 4 metres wide, the proposal seeks to demolish the wall between 44 and 46 and use a shared surface, and these arrangements will be acceptable in highway terms.

I have documentation to prove **the applicant has a maximum of 12 feet 3ins (3.7mts) of access** (See Photographs and Plans) This strip of land belonged originally to No 42 and was sold in 1954 to give access to Ferringham Lane from the dwelling known as Paddock House at land behind me. From my gate post at 42 across to the wall at 46 the measurement is 3.7mtrs. Properties along the lane own up to the middle of the road within their respective boundary lines. Therefore the applicant has control of the 12ft or thereabouts in front of his access entrance.

There is no shared surface.

The applicant does not own the boundary wall of 46, therefore has no power to demolish it.

It also states: *The applicant welcomes planning conditions to secure visibility splays.*

Having also read the Reeves Transport and Technical report I would point out

The applicant has no control over the visibility splays. (See photographs supplied)

Parked vehicles either side of the exit will obscure such.

I am unsure as to how a GRAMPAN style type planning condition could solve this?

Vehicles parked outside the exit will not only obscure or reduce visibility splays, they will limit the size of vehicle attempting to gain access or depart. Vehicles leaving will pull out into a single lane carrying both north and southbound traffic, with the added complication of a vehicle/s waiting to enter the site, who will not be able to even see the proposed traffic light system until it is too late and block the traffic anyway. The traffic flow chart does not allow for this eventuality.

Where is the traffic light going to be placed? Can it be seen?

Why do Reeves Transport think that three vehicles attempting to enter at one time is unlikely? The possibility of 20 vehicles resident, then allowing for visitors/trade/delivery services etc. I think it is more than likely.

I would like to point out the **West Sussex County Council Strategic Planning Consultation is a Desktop study only, using plans submitted with the application.**

Surely it would be better if someone came out to the site and did independant measurements and surveys to check the viability of the project. I have had to consult with Chartered Surveyors and Solicitors and spent considerable time researching the boundaries to enable me to discount the 4mtr. access stated and endorse the boundaries, when this office probably already have easy access to this on file.

In the interest of the public and the village as a whole, why am I having to do this time consuming, and potentially costly, research?

Yours faithfully,

Elisabeth Hutchings

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MEETING Re: Planning Application FG69/15/OUT
Held on 13TH JULY 2016 at Arun District Council HQ, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton.
OBJECTION LETTER - Read out on my behalf by Mr. William Harvey of Cedar CL

Good afternoon, I am here to speak on behalf of Liz Hutchings of 42 Ferringham Lane, who, due to prior commitments cannot attend in person.

She has lived next door to Paddock House for 25 years.

Together with her neighbours at No.46, the current nature of her home will be most adversely affected by the development proposal. She would like to point out this application and the developers actions have caused her family much stress and anxiety over the past year or so.

Three times she, her neighbours and numerous others villagers have submitted written objections and sent in supporting material against, whilst those in favour are merely the developer and his agents for their own financial gain, together with a few dubiously acquired supporters, yet we understand the recommendation is to conditionally approve this application?

What message would such approval send out? Come to Ferring, buy a big house and we will allow you to cram 4-5 houses on the plot, profit and move on, without a care in the world for the villagers who have objected and whose lives and homes of many years have been irrevocably changed forever.

Will this approach solve the housing shortage? No, it will gradually ruin our villages across the whole country, and as elected members surely your duty is to your constituents and not to small scale greedy developers who wish to destroy village charm and concrete it over.

Neither condition required for width of access or creation of visibility splays can be met.

Firstly, you already acknowledge the access width along the entire length of the drive is less than the legal requirement. Miss Hutchings has also supplied proof of such, as the land originally belonged to her plot.

Secondly, visibility splays at the entrance/exit cannot be achieved as the current width available is 12ft 3ins. in total up to the middle of the road.

Miss Hutchings has previously supplied photos of where her vehicles will be parked outside her property if necessary.

There will be very limited visibility and certainly no splay.

More importantly access is inadequate for large vehicles and dangerous for all pedestrian users, whether the elderly, children and mothers with prams etcetera.

If the scheme is approved the implications will be for the existing large, family house with no garden or privacy left, to be possibly turned into flats thus creating further traffic flow and a parking shortage that will doubtless see cars spill out on to lane and create further on street parking problems.

Miss Hutchings strongly urges you not to approve the application on this basis.

Conditional approval will lead to nothing short of her family having to live with the constant threat of future development from now on. Likewise for all the villagers, we are just ordinary people wishing to retain Ferring as a quiet, safe, seaside village, our home.

Thank you.

Objection to The Planning Inspectorate submitted on line.

29.03.17

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/W/17/3166634

Outline Planning application FG/196/15/OUT
44 Ferringham Lane, Ferring

In addition to previous letters and documentation regarding my objections to the above
a further written representation is as follows:

This application was refused by Arun District Council Planning Committee at the Development Control Meeting of 13th. July 2016. It did not meet the necessary access requirements.

The driveway in question measures 3.63m across by the council and myself (see previous legal documentation supplied by both to support this) and has done for 63 years.
In 1954 12ft was sold from my plot at 42 to create access to a plot behind, now 44, thus forming my northern boundary between us that has been in situ and unchallenged since.

Without the acquisition of further land to create width of access and visual splays these access requirements cannot be achieved.

Despite this the plans submitted for appeal have remained unchanged to date without alteration or addition. Therefore it still does not measure up to planning requirements.
and permission for such should not be granted.

Elisabeth Hutchings
42 Ferringham Lane
Ferring
West Sussex.
BN12 5LU



