PxC

1 Maple Close,

Worthing,

Sussex.

BN13 3DR.

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
15 FEB 2012
RECEIVED

ACK

14/02/2012

RE PLANNING APPLICATION FG/ 151/1

MAGPIES ,52 SEA LANE FERRING.

The erection of 1 large detached house and garage.

Dear Sirs,

Firstly I wish to apologise for the late objections to the planning application.

We own 8 Laburnum Close, Ferring. This property is currently let and we have only just been told of the proposed planning application.

1. Our objection to this development would block a considerable amount of light from the rear of our property, together with that of 9/10 and 11.
2. The property being so close would take away our privacy .
3. If the council where to grant the proposal to build, it would set a precedent for others with large gardens to build on back fill land.
4. The proposed property is not in keeping with the existing properties in the area, being character houses and bungalows.
5. This property will put extra traffic flow onto Sea Lane at a point where visibility is difficult.

I trust we are not too late to have our letter included in the file.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Mr and Mrs G E MOORE

PXC

Bramble Cottage
50 Sea Lane
Ferring
West Sussex
BN12 5EH
[redacted]

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
7 - FEB 2012
RECEIVED

2 Feb 2012

Arun District Council
Planning Department
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

Dear Sir/Madam

Reference I/NET000012217 Planning Application FG/151/11

I wish to oppose planning permission on the grounds that my cottage which is next to this property is a Listed Building and I don't believe that it fits in with the local strategic plan. Also I have right of access to the drive.

Plus please tell me does this contravene planning rules as these new properties will be too close to a thatched cottage, which I believe contravenes Fire Regulations?

Also the proposed building will encroach on my property.

My Property is:
Bramble Cottage
50 Sea lane
Ferring
BN12 5EH

Yours faithfully

[redacted]
John O'Dor

Miss C Willson
2Laburnum Close
Ferring
Worthing
West Sussex
BN12 5EJ

Your Ref: 000012238
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

8th February 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 7th February 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *I wish to object to the application on the following grounds:-*□
> □
> *1. The proposal increases the number of vehicles using the entrance on to a narrow part of Sea Lane opposite a flint wall and will increase the risk to other road users. This is particularly relevant as the view from the entrance to the north is partially restricted by the adjacent property at No 50 Sea Lane which is situated extremely close to the roadway.*□
> □
> *2. Whilst the plans claim to maintain appropriate distances from Magpies and No 50 Sea Lane, no such consideration appears to have been given to the properties to the west of the site. Both the new dwelling and the existing bungalows are close to the dividing boundary and the new dwelling would inevitably have a detrimental effect on the enjoyment and light available to the existing properties.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

inetlete

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete

Anthony May
103 Northease Drive
Hove
East Sussex
BN3 8LH

Your Ref: 000012223
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

7th February 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 6th February 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

I must strongly object to the above application on the following grounds:□
□
1.The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of backland development which would have an adverse affect on the privacy and quiet of the bungalows in Laburnum Close: particularly No.9 which it will be directly behind. The height of the proposed new building which is far higher than the application refused last year is excessive and much higher than the existing garages which are already too high at 5.9metres. Due to the height of the proposed development and the closeness to the boundary of 9 Laburnum Close, many windows in the proposed development will look directly into the garden, kitchen and living room of 9 Laburnum Close and therefore will be extremely detrimental to the privacy of this property.□
□
2.The increase use of existing access to the public highway, Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.□
□
3.The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.□
□
4.The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in laburnum close that back on to magpies.□
□
5.If this proposal were permitted it would set a grave precedence for backland development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.□
□
6.It is therefore over development of the area and against national and local government policy.□

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be

inetlete

X

reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete

Barbara Danet
103 Northease Drive
Hove
BN3 8LH

Your Ref: 000012224
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

7th February 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 6th February 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

I must strongly object to the above application on the following grounds:□
□
1.The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of backland development which would have an adverse affect on the privacy and quiet of the bungalows in Laburnum Close: particularly No.9 which it will be directly behind. The height of the proposed new building which is far higher than the application refused last year is excessive and much higher than the existing garages which are already too high at 5.9metres. Due to the height of the proposed development and the closeness to the boundary of 9 Laburnum Close, many windows in the proposed development will look directly into the garden, kitchen and living room of 9 Laburnum Close and therefore will be extremely detrimental to the privacy of this property.□
□
2.The increase use of existing access to the public highway, Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.□
□
3.The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.□
□
4.The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in laburnum close that back on to magpies.□
□
5.If this proposal were permitted it would set a grave precedence for backland development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.□
□
6.It is therefore over development of the area and against national and local government policy.□

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be

inetlete

X

reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete

To: **John O'Dor**

NOTIFICATION FROM ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
APPLICATION NO: FG/151/11/

Site Address:	Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring BN12 5EH
Grid Reference:	509764 -102303
Category:	Plan Applicat'n
Description of Works:	Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies

---

Thank you for your email which I received on 5th February 2012 which has been recorded as 'an objection'. The officer dealing with this application is Mr P Cleveland who can be contacted on telephone number 01903 737631.

Planning Services operates an 'open file' policy and your comments will be made available on the file for people to view and they may be published on the Arun District Council website. Please ensure that you have only made comments that you are happy to have published in this way. If you have supplied information belonging to a third party, please check that you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your correspondence to appear on the 'open file', please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will be disregarded.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to respond to each letter of representation individually but your views will be considered before the application is determined. I will notify you of the decision. In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State for consideration. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity for you to comment at the appeal stage.

The majority of planning applications are determined by officers under delegated power and if this application is determined by an officer, you will receive notification of the decision in due course. Some applications are determined by Members at the Development Control Committee, if this is the case, I will endeavour to advise you of the date of the meeting and the procedures for public speaking. However, please be aware that because the cut off date for notifying the public of the meeting, is more than two weeks before the actual meeting, it is possible that we will have received your letter of representation after the notification letters have been sent out. In these circumstances you will not receive notification of the meeting. I would advise all interested parties to track the progress of the application on the website. To check whether an application is on the Development Control Agenda and for details about public speaking, please visit our website at:

http://www.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=DEVEOPMENTCONTROLA&objectid=5594

Please rest assured, that whether or not you receive notification of the committee meeting, any comments received up until the committee meeting will be taken into account, even if they have to be given to Members as an update at the actual meeting.

Thank you for your interest.

Planning Case Officer

Please save the link below and use our online comments facility for making future objections, supports or other representations on planning applications:

http://www.arun.gov.uk/main.cfm?type=COMMENTINGONAPPLIC

pmac20_email

FG/151/11/

John O'Dor
Bramble Cottage 50 Sea Lane Ferring Worthing
BN12 5EH

[redacted]

05-FEB-2012 000012217

Y

I wish to oppose planning permission on the grounds that my cottage which is next to this property is a Listed Building and I don't believe that it fits in with the local strategic plan. Also I have right of access to the drive. □
□
Plus please tell me does this contravene planning rules as these new properties will be too close to a thatched cottage, which I believe contravenes Fire Regulations?□
Also the proposed building will encroach on my property.

06-FEB-20

OPS$JDG

3

Paul Gilbert
142 Alinora Crescent
Goring by Sea
Worthing
BN12 4HL

Your Ref: 000012200
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

1st February 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

ACK

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 1st February 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *We plan to move to Ferring as soon as possible, but are put off many locations due to (in our opinion)unsympathetic over development. This large house is positioned so close to the bungalows in Laburnum Close that all their privacy will be lost. I feel that a single storey property, positioned a greater distance from the rear border of the plot would be more in keeping with the surroundings. Kind regards, Paul.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete

PXC

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
2 - FEB 2012
RECEIVED

Mrs Sally Tanner
5 Laburnum Close
Ferring
Worthing
BN12 6EJ

Ref. No.
FG 151/11

ACK

30.1.2012

Dear Mr. Cleveland,

I am writing to object to the proposal that has been applied for by Mr. Jenkins, regarding the developement around Magpies Cottage.

Several aspects would be very detrimental to the area and our neighbours.

Objections are: 1) His too large and much to high for this bungalow area, 2) Access to + from This proposed development would cause increased traffic in Sea lane, which is now already a busy

road, 3) Because of the size and height this property would affect the privacy of neighbouring bungalows, 4) A precedence would be made for other people to extend or develop in this area, thinking it was acceptable to be greedy with their land.

I sincerely hope this proposed development will not be allowed but refused on the grounds that it would be against all consideration and sympathy with residents, who came to live here in a quiet, rural village.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

PJC

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
31 JAN 2012
RECEIVED

BETTY MARTIN
6 LABURNUM CLOSE
FERRING
WEST SUSSEX
BN 12 5EJ

30-1-12

ACK

Mr P Cleveland

Dear Sir

Planning application FG/151/11

I must object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of back land development which together with the use of the proposed access would be unneighbourly and adversely affect the privacy and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties including those in Laburnum Close that back on to the proposed development and be in conflict with existing polices.
2. The increase use of the existing access to the public highway Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.
3. The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.
4. The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in Laburnum Close that back on to Magpies.
5. If this proposal were permitted it would set a dangerous precedence for back land development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.

Yours Faithfully [redacted]

RC

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
31 JAN 2012
RECEIVED

Mrs M & K Kinsey
3 Laburnum Close
Ferring
BN12 5EJ

29/1/12

ACK

Mr P Cleveland

Dear Sir

Planning application FG/151/11

I must object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of back land development which together with the use of the proposed access would be unneighbourly and adversely affect the privacy and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties including those in Laburnum Close that back on to the proposed development and be in conflict with existing polices.
2. The increase use of the existing access to the public highway Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.
3. The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.
4. The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in Laburnum Close that back on to Magpies.
5. If this proposal were permitted it would set a dangerous precedence for back land development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.

Yours Faithfully

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: TERENCE FRISBY [redacted]
Sent: 30 January 2012 10:06
To: Planning
Subject: 'Magpies' Development

Dear Sir,

Application No. FG/151/11 'Magpies Development

We wish to register an objection to the Planning Application for the above-headed development.

It was our hope that this type of two-for-one, back garden development had come to an end in Ferring.
It is our opinion that such a proposal is out of keeping with the immediate area and would exacerbate traffic problems in this location.

We come back to our *enough is enough* view, one that we hope that you will share.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. & Mrs T.A.Frisby

31/01/2012

PLC

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
30 JAN 2012
RECEIVED

11 LABURNUM CLOSE
FERRING
BN12 5EJ

27 JANUARY 2012

Mr P Cleveland

ACK

Dear Sir

Planning application FG/151/11

I must object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of back land development which together with the use of the proposed access would be unneighbourly and adversely affect the privacy and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties including those in Laburnum Close that back on to the proposed development and be in conflict with existing polices.
2. The increase use of the existing access to the public highway Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.
3. The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.
4. The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in Laburnum Close that back on to Magpies.
5. If this proposal were permitted it would set a dangerous precedence for back land development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.

Yours Faithfully

[redacted]

PXC

ACK

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TECHNICAL SUPPORT
30 JAN 2012
ACTION...
(of 5)

Mrs C May
9 Laburnum Close
Ferring
Worthing
BN12 5EJ

27~~26~~th January 2012.

Mr P Cleveland

Dear Sir

Planning application FG/151/11

I must object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of back land development and would be unneighbourly and adversely effect my privacy and quiet enjoyment of my property. The height of the proposed new building is excessively high and way above the existing garages which are already too high at 5.9 meters, it is also far higher than the application that was refused last year. Because of the closeness to my boundary and also the height of the development numerous windows will look directly into my garden, kitchen and lounge and therefore be extremely detrimental to my property.
2. The increase use of the existing access to the public highway Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.
3. The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.
4. The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in Laburnum Close that back on to Magpies.
5. If this proposal were permitted it would set a dangerous precedence for back land development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.
6. It is therefore over development of the area and against national and local government policy.

PXC

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
27 JAN 2012
RECEIVED

10, Ansisters Road,
Ferring,
BN12 5JG

25.1.12

ACK

Head of Planning,
Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road,
Littlehampton

Ref: FG/151/11 "Magpies" Sea Lane
Objection

Dear Sir,

A two house development on this site was refused last year. The developers have come back with one house and double garage, this is still overcrowding on that site.

Sea Lane is a very busy road with ever increasing traffic, another feed onto it increases the hazards.

Back garden developments which are spoiling the whole village feel, should become a thing of the past as the housing quota will be met by the enormous developments already proposed for the surrounding area.

The amount of traffic coming into the village which has, with little exception, no pavements and no street lighting, will worsen, exacerbating this by more housing, can only be described as foolhardy and dangerous .

Please give consideration to the points made, especially on the safety aspect, with more and more young families moving into the village.

[redacted]

Mrs.N.Cummings

J. and V Bender
48 Sea Lane
Ferring
West Sussex
BN12 5EH

Your Ref: 000012181
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

30th January 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 27th January 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *We object on the grounds that the proposed dwelling with the adjoining double garage is only 2 metres away from our side fence and would throw a large shadow over our garden and cut out a considerable amount of light. Moreover, the proposed large property would be cramped on such a small plot and detrimental to the character of the surrounding properties and therefore unneighbourly. Our view from the back of our house and garden would be blighted. Also to be taken into account is the extra traffic flow using the single shared driveway which would increase noise and pollution levels.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

Inetlete

Mr. P. Cleveland
The Planning Dept
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TECHNICAL SUPPORT
27 JAN 2012
ACTION...
(1 of 5)

John Mayer
10 Laburnum Close
Ferring
Worthing, West Sussex
BN12 5EJ

26 JAN 2012

PXC

ACK

REF PLANNING APPLICATION
FG/151/11

I object to the above application on the ground that the proposal would constitute a very unsatisfactory form of BACK LAND DEVELOPMENT, being particularly unneighbourly to me affecting my Privacy. Sea Lane these days has become a very busy highway, another adden to this road, to service this large Private development would be very HAZARDS indeed!!

This proposal would be very DETRIMENTAL to the properties in Laburnum close as a whole, in particular to those backing on to Magpies. Such a development would set a dangerous precedence for ALL FERRING and set a very serious change of policy by ARUN DISTRICT PLANNING DEPT.!!!!

[redacted]

PXC

ACK

Mr T Harman
7 Laburnum Close
Ferring
Worthing
BN12 5EJ

Mr P Cleveland

Dear Sir

Planning application FG/151/11

I must object to the above application on the following grounds.

1. The proposal would constitute an unsatisfactory form of back land development which together with the use of the proposed access would be unneighbourly and adversely affect the privacy and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties including those in Laburnum Close that back on to the proposed development and be in conflict with existing polices.
2. The increase use of the existing access to the public highway Sea Lane would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.
3. The access is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and visibility.
4. The new development would be extremely detrimental to the bungalows in Laburnum Close that back on to Magpies.
5. If this proposal were permitted it would set a dangerous precedence for back land development in Ferring and would alter the character of the locality to the serious detriment of the amenities of the area in conflict with planning policy.
6. It is therefore over development of the area and against national and local government policy.

[redacted]

23/01/2012

Mr P. CLEVELAND
THE PLANNING DEPT
ARUN CIVIC CENTRE
MALTRAVERS ROAD
LITTLEHAMPTON
BN17 5LF

Planning Dept
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road, Littlehampton
West Sussex, BN17 5LF

DXC

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
24 JAN 2012
RECEIVED

Mr & Mrs M.M.Tanner
5 Laburnum Close
Ferring, Worthing,
West Sussex. BN12 5EJ
[redacted]

24th January, 2012.

ACK

Dear Sir,

Planning Application Ref No FG151/11. Land R/O Nagfies Sea Lane Ferring BN12 5EH. Detached dwelling, 3 garages, 6-7 rooms.

I refer to the above application to which I object. Also I refer to application Ref No FG/57/11 on the same site to which I objected, letter 7th July, 2011, refers. This was refused by letter of 20th July, 2011 for essentially the same reasons for this objection. These are 1. 'Backland' garden grabfield 2. Condition on the Guild of 'Nagfies' and double garage that no subsequent development be permitted. 3. The detrimental effect on the street scene, local character and the quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties, in particular 8, 9, 10 & 11 Laburnum Close, Grade II Bramble Cottage, & adjacent Sea Lane properties. 4. The Gruden on the

X

drainage and sewerage infrastructure and the consequential flooding risks. 5. The heightened road traffic hazard by increased vehicle movements on to and from Sea Lane. The existing 'splays' are inadequate to the North and the speed and volume of traffic is already extremely hazardous. To that reason alone, this application should be refused. 6. There is a very strong feeling amongst Fenning Residents that opportunist development; 42 Sea Lane refused for similar reasons; and the erosion and spoilation of the Village should not create precedent. The size and mass is not consistent with a Village style eroded by selfish considerations.

I urge you to refuse this application and look forward to your decision.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

David Bettiss
8 Tamarisk Way
Ferring
BN12 5ER

Your Ref: 000012171
Our Ref: FG/151/11/[redacted]
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

25th January 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 24th January 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *I object to this application for a number of reasons. I note that there was a previous application on this same site last year for 2 dwellings which was quite rightly refused, and I personally objected to that one as well. The only realistic difference on this application is that it has been reduced from 2 dwellings to one detached one, but the main principles remain exactly the same.*
> *It is quite simply an over development of a congested and surrounded site, which is out of character to its surroundings, and has no benefit to the local community, other than a commercial one to the landowners.*
> *There will be clearance of so called "scrub", which must have an adverse effect on local wildlife and the general biodiversity of the area.*
> *The access issues highlighted in the previous objection are exactly the same (only that there are now 2 households vehicles using the narrow access lane rather than three). The danger of extra vehicles emerging on to Sea Lane with its notoriously bad sight lines remain from this narrow entrance, which can only worsen road safety issues.*
> *Finally, additional development here will add further to the well publicised pressure on local services, especially drainage issues, doctors, schools, and where it cannot be justified such as here, it must be resisted for the benefit of an already overstretched and congested community.*
> *The right decision was reached on the last application, and for almost an identical application here, I would urge that for the benefit of very local residents such as myself once again it be refused.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you

Linda Nicholls
9 Foamcourt Waye
Fe[redacted]g
Worthing
BN12 5RD

Your Ref: 000012150
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

20th January 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 19th January 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *Ridiculous proposal. Houses would be far too close together, adding to flooding problems (lack of open land for drainage), loss of wildlife habitat, increased traffic with an extra house having at least one car and probably at least two, more strain on the already stretched infrastructure. Sea Lane is already difficult to access, because of poor visibility, from Beehive Lane and Sea Lane Gardens to name but two - we do not need more hazards on this narrow, well used road which also accommodates a bus route. No more infilling PLEASE.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete

PXL

4 Greenways Crescent
FERRING
Worthing
West Sussex BN12 5EF

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
20 JAN 2012
RECEIVED

19 January 2012

Your Ref: FG/151/11

Planning Department
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
LITTLEHAMPTON
West Sussex BN17 5LF

ACK

Dear Sirs

Planning Application ref (see above)

I should like my objection to the planning application for another house with double garage within the existing back garden of Magpies. This would leave minimum space for anyone to enjoy privacy in their own new house and the adjoining properties.

The village is becoming overcrowded already with back gardens being built on and a property site building into two property sites.

The exit from this site on to Sea Lane would cause severe problems to local and through traffic. The impact on the skyline would also be detrimental. The outward appearance is unlikely to be in the local vernacular thereby adding to that impact. I therefore ask that this application be refused.

Yours truly,

[redacted]

P Bentley BEd CertEd

Ferring Conservation Group
17 West Drive
Ferring
WORTHING
BN12 5QZ

Your Ref: 000012139
Our Ref: FG/151/11/
Please ask for:
Mr P Cleveland

18th January 2012

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Demolition of existing large double garage & erection of 1no. detached dwelling house, together with additional double garage for Magpies
Magpies 52 Sea Lane Ferring

Thank you for your internet representation made on 17th January 2012 which has been recorded as **an objection'** with the comments as follows:

> *Ferring Conservation Group objects to this application on the same grounds as for the application for two houses at this site last year. Building additional houses in back gardens is out of character with the area and bringing more traffic through a narrow driveway onto Sea Lane would be adding to existing problems of access and visibility for traffic turning onto Sea Lane (whatever WSCC may say to the contrary, this is the daily experience of residents in Sea Lane and roads entering it).* □
> *The Council was quite right to refuse the previous application (FG/57/11) because the site was 'unsuitable in size, shape and position' and 'damaging the character of the surrounding area'. The present application for a large house and double garage is for a similar large building mass.*□
> *The other ground for refusal was the lack of any contribution to affordable housing. We see no evidence that the present application makes such a contribution.* □
> *The site is a garden, not 'previpously developed land, and we trust the Council will refuse this application*□
> *Ed Miller, Secretary, Ferring Conservation Group*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and may publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permisison to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning

inetlete

permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning Services & Housing Strategy

inetlete