



From: Stuart Corbey
Sent: 09 October 2018 09:27
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: FG/129/18/PL

Please can we upload as an objection to the above ref. redaction required.

From: 
Sent: 08 October 2018 18:36
To: Stuart Corbey
Subject: FG/129/18/PL

Dear Mr.Corbey,

Please find attached a further objection to the above application following the recently posted extension advice.
Please place my comment on the public portal as a "rep letter" and I would respectfully ask that my email address not be shown.

Many thanks

E.Hutchings

Further objection to FG/129/18/PL

Parishoners and more importantly The Parish Council have objected consistently from the outset of this proposed development. I cannot see how a further extension or a committee meeting will be anything other than a waste of valuable time and Ratepayers money.

The applicants photos cannot be seen to be mitigating in anyway as they do not demonstrate a realistic scenario. Where is the HGV shown NOT having to squeeze past a cyclist or mother and toddler? Where is the HGV in the photos at all?

A 4m. access condition was originally put in place by ADC Planning Dept. acting on advice from WSCC Highways, on application for a two bedroom retirement bungalow scheme. It subsequently went for appeal and The Inspectorate upheld the 4m condition and granted outline permission on this basis.

However, the final approved proposal is now for two storey, 3-bedroom family homes, resulting in even more pedestrians i.e. parents with toddlers, walkers with children and dogs, or groups of school children on bikes and visiting friends etc. so perhaps there is even a case that the 4m. should now become wider rather than narrower to reflect this change and additional use?

The photo below shows a small supermarket delivery vehicle (hardly an HGV) recently taken in said drive, note the position of the side mirrors and available space.

A parent would have to walk a toddler/s in front or behind to create single file or have to carry them past trying meanwhile trying to avoid those mirrors, and what will they do with the dog on the lead and the buggy?



This is why 4m was made a condition, and if a width variation is now permitted it will make a mockery of the whole planning process.

Will an application to drop the splay conditions be applied for next?

E.Hutchings
42 Ferringham Lane.