






Sent: 06 November 2018 19:46

To: Planning

Subject: Planning Application FG/159/18 - Objection.

Arun Planning Dept,

Please see attached document where I have set out my **objection** to Planning Application FG/159/18 which closes on 8th November.

I tried to send it via the online link on your website, but it came back to indicate the wording was to be restricted to 3800. I amended it to contain 3791 characters, pressed the submit button, but there was no indication it had actually been sent. Hence the submission of my objection by this email.

Please confirm receipt of this email and the fact that my objection has been recorded.

Kind regards,

Paul Croyden
41 West Drive, Ferring, BN12 5QY



Status: Object.

I would like to lodge my objection to the application for a major extension to the Bluebird Café in Ferring (FG/159/18) for the following reasons:

- Unnecessary overdevelopment.
- Unacceptable increase in traffic.
- An increased risk for the safety of pedestrians.

The Ferring beach and surrounding residential area are quite unique in Sussex, therefore it is paramount that this uniqueness and tranquillity is preserved for the pleasure of future generations. One aspect which would destroy this uniqueness would be this planned overdevelopment of the Bluebird Café. It must be borne in mind that Ferring is a small community area which does not yearn to compete with the likes of Worthing or Brighton seaside resorts for the provision of leisure services. This planned expansion of the café would significantly and irreversibly alter the unique and natural character of the area.

This application clearly falls within the category of unnecessary overdevelopment, which, if it were to go ahead, would detract from the beauty and tranquillity of this unique unspoilt beach and residential environment. It is therefore unquestionable that its preservation as is, must be deemed a priority consideration.

The car park is currently and continually used by a great number of people driving to use the café, just visiting the beach or for exercising their dogs. The car park, which has limited space available, is regularly soon filled to capacity at the peak times during the summer months, school holidays and at weekends throughout the year. As a result of the car park being full, drivers then resort to parking their vehicles in the adjacent roads, (i.e. West Drive, South Drive and Ocean Drive – all of which are private roads funded and maintained by the residents). Such intense parking on those relatively narrow roads, all of which are a designated public bus route, causes serious congestion and reduces the traffic flow in one direction at a time. Consequently, traffic hold-ups inevitably and regularly occur, which could conceivably impede access to the area for emergency vehicles, residents trying to enter or leave their property and overall generally exasperating drivers who at times resort to taking unnecessary driving risks.

Due to the significant amount of traffic caused at those peak times, difficulty is experienced by pedestrians, many of whom are elderly or young children either walking or in pushchairs, negotiating the busy narrow roadways on foot as there are no pavements. It should be pointed out the roads are subject to a

30mph speed limit, and not 20mph as has been incorrectly stated in the Transport Statement (Para 4.1) submitted by the ill-informed applicant. Similarly, the same problems are evident during peak times for pedestrians walking down the car park feeder access, which incidentally is a legally designated public footpath.

It is therefore abundantly clear the planned significant enlargement of the café to increase the seating capacity, would attract considerably more people to the area, thereby adversely affecting the traffic problems already existent.

Finally, it is very pertinent to point out that the owner of the Bluebird Café staged two recent public meetings to discuss the plans. Both meetings were extremely well attended by local residents, and it is relevant to note that the overwhelming majority were vociferous in their objection to the plans, with only the odd muted response in favour. To me, this application speaks volumes, as those two so-called consultation events were a pointless and meaningless exercise, as the considered and rational concerns voiced by the audiences have been totally ignored by the owner, who is pressing ahead knowingly and regardless of the extensive local opposition to these plans.