

4 BEEHIVE LANE
FERRING
WORTHING
WEST SUSSEX
BN12 5NL

Head of Planning & Development
Arun District Council
Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton BN17 5LF

FTAO: Mrs Gardner

19th September 2017

Dear Sir,

Ref: Application No FG/135/17/PL – 1 Beehive Lane, Ferring

As one objector has already stated, "Surprise, Surprise". I strongly object to this application and I strongly object to the way the developer and his so called professional advisors are attempting to deliberately manipulate the planning system and thereby attempting to deceive Councillors, Planning Officers and of course the local residents.

The approval for 8 flats included the provision of a communal garden for the future residents which acted as a visual gap between the proposed art deco flats and the contrasting appearance of the existing character of the properties in Beehive Lane, which are mainly detached bungalows, chalets and houses. This gap is essential to separate the alien appearance of the art deco flats from the prevailing character of Beehive Lane. The proposed additional art deco dwelling (whose appearance is abysmal) within this gap and immediately adjacent to 3 Beehive Lane removes any provision of a suitable or meaningful visual gap, contrary to the recommendations of the Inspector on the Appeal for the 10 flats and the planning approval for 8 flats.

In the Planning Statement prepared by Henry Adams, the last sentence to para 4.4 states "The CGI image which accompanies the application demonstrates how the proposal will sit comfortably in the street scene". NO IT DOESN'T. The CGI image deliberately fails to show 3 Beehive Lane so of course it is not showing honestly how the proposal fits in the street scene and how it will impact on the adjoining bungalow. They also comment in the same paragraph that the additional dwelling would not undermine the visual gap as a transition between differing characters. YES OF COURSE IT WOULD. The Inspector advocated a visual separation between the art deco flats and the existing properties in Beehive Lane which was reinforced in the current approval. It is clear, therefore, that Criterion (ii) to saved Policy GEN 7 is NOT met by this application.

In the same Planning Statement, para 4.6 attempts to justify the impact on 3 Beehive Lane by referring to the earlier chalet approval FG/132/12. This is incorrect and a complete deception as this approval is no longer valid and of course cannot now be implemented. The comparison should have been with the current and implemented approval which provided for a communal garden adjacent to 3 Beehive Lane as part of the benefit for the flats. In the context of the current approval, of course, the new dwelling will have a very significant and detrimental impact on this property with a 3.3m high rendered parapet wall within 1.1m of its boundary and will result in AN OBVIOUS LOSS OF AMENITY over what no 3 Beehive Lane would enjoy with the adjoining communal garden under the current approval. In addition, there is a very significant loss of amenity for the future occupants of the 8 flats due to the removal of their proposed communal garden area. It is clear, therefore, that Criterion (iv) to saved Policy GEN 7 is also NOT met by this application.

On this subject, I have also read the objection from the occupier of no 3 Beehive Lane and I find the behaviour of the developer in the deception of this elderly lady quite shocking.

In my opinion (along with many other local residents) the proposed car parking provision of 10 spaces within the approved scheme was insufficient for 8 two bedroom flats. The new application is not providing for any additional parking on site, which means nine two bedroom dwellings have to share 10 spaces, all of which will apparently be unallocated if this can be believed (see Planning Statement para 5.6). It is likely that some of the flats will have two cars, so it will be a first come basis for the use of the spaces with the unlucky residents and visitors parking presumably in Beehive Lane or in front of the shops and flats opposite. This will inevitably be extremely stressful for all concerned. I imagine that the spaces have to be unallocated or the car parking provision will not meet current standards, so I presume the LPA must be responsible for monitoring this. I am afraid I cannot envisage this happening. I actually find it hard to believe the developer will not sell the flats without an allocated space each which would mean the parking provision is insufficient, which of course it is.

On an incidental matter, I have noted that some of the objectors have stated that the developer has already sold all the eight flats off plan by marketing the flats solely in London, at least some of which are likely to be as second homes. If this is correct, surely this goes against the requirement within the Ferring Neighbourhood Plan that all new residential development should provide badly needed additional dwellings for local residents? Indeed, Henry Adams states the provision of additional dwellings for local residents as one of the primary objectives for the approval of eight flats within their Planning Statement to FG/186/16OUT paras 4.13 – 4.15. Surely the LPA should be safeguarding this requirement.

Please refuse this application for the following reasons:

- (1) It will be an overdevelopment of the site
- (2) The new dwelling will be out of character with the adjoining properties in Beehive Lane
- (3) The new dwelling will have a serious impact on the amenity of the immediately adjacent dwelling contrary to the provisions of Gen 7 (ii and iv) of the Arun District Plan
- (4) The car parking provision is inadequate for nine two bedroom dwellings
- (5) The reduced amenity and garden space for the approved eight flats will be inadequate

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Richard Smale.

Richard Smale