

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 October 2021 10:23
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: OBJECTION - FG/163/21/PL

Objection.

Simon J Davis MRTPI
Principal Planning Officer
Directorate of Place

T: 01903 737874
E: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

Arun is a CIL Charging Authority, for more information go to www.arun.gov.uk/cil
Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Peter Hyatt [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 October 2021 18:26
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: OBJECTION - FG/163/21/PL

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Mr S Davis,

I have attached a letter of representation in regards to FG/163/21/PL

Please could you email me to confirm you have received this email and the attachment.

kind regards
Peter Hyatt Snr
Millwood House

Letter of representation for FG/163/21/PL

Representation made by Mr. Peter Hyatt & Mrs Kim Hyatt at Millwood House, Littlehampton Road, Ferring, West Sussex BN12 6PG

Our property is the closest agricultural property that will be most negatively affected by this development proposal, although we are only a small site and agricultural businesses are being railroaded we hope you consider this application with us in mind.

We have no objection to our neighbours finding a use for this site that would earn them an income but we feel it should not come at a cost of the agricultural/horticultural history and purposes of the site or our privacy and safety. This proposal brings with it serious cause for concern.

Access and driveway

- 1) There would be a significant increase in traffic flow, using the current planned access would also move the said increase traffic **even closer** to our family home and private garden.
- 2) The proposed access route to the main site, once you enter the applicant's property through his gates, is higher than our land, therefore all coming and going traffic would be able to see directly into private garden, living room and bedroom.
- 3) The entrance to the proposed site runs alongside our **private garden**, with the hours of business this application proposes (06:00 to 22:00), along with the intention to employ up to five members of staff we would have no let off from cars or commercial vehicles. These times are also only operational hours and therefore means we would have to endure the coming and goings of staff potentially up to or beyond an hour before the business start time. This application seeks to completely remove our resident's rights to quiet enjoyment of our home and garden.
- 4) The additional and **constant** increase of traffic that comes with this proposal puts our bordering trees at an increased risk of dying due to the volume of vehicle fumes. The application relies on the fact that there is already an established entrance there, but this current access road is 6ft away from our bordering trees, giving them a greater chance of survival. If their traffic causes our trees to die that would leave us completely exposed. The passing traffic would be completely on our doorstep.
- 5) There has been no thought or consideration given to us, this proposal would have a severely **detrimental effect** on what is our apple tree patch, staying in respect to the agricultural tie on our land. We have spent close to a year restoring our apple tree patch back to good health under the guidance of local professionals with a large number of trees on order to replace the ones that died. With the increase in constant traffic volume and fumes this application would completely destroy the progression made.
- 6) The entrance to the proposed site is split, the applicant's **actual** entrance is only 4.2m, the A259 is a fast road (50mph) and the sharp turn into their ACTUAL allowed entrance would give rise to accidents. The owner of the access road and other businesses that are associated with the access road have already refused to give permission for the applicant to use any of their access route, this means the applicant would need to be able to get into his site without crossing the boundary line, it also means there is no guarantee the owners of the main access road will not put a boundary fence in place. Currently the local refuse drivers refuse to enter the said site due to safety concerns, I fail to see how the applicant will be able to safely take delivery of boats for the proposed marina business with potentially no limit to the vehicle and trailer length.

The plot

Currently the proposed site holds **perfectly good greenhouses**, (although the applicant has already began removing the glass panels himself). The applicant states they have attempted to use the sites greenhouses for their correct purposes with no success, this is not completely accurate as the applicant has only owned the property for one year and within the first month attempted to wholesale the glass panels from the greenhouses to all surrounding neighbours.

The proposed change of use for this site also gives us some serious cause for concerns that we feel should be considered with the upmost respect.

- 1) The proposed usage will give the applicant the legal right to completely **disregard** our right to enjoy our own garden, the applicant is currently using the site for karate classes in a packing shed that does not have permission, a shed the applicant knows to be built with **asbestos**.
- 2) As stated above we take issue with the proposed operating hours, which are **06:00 to 22:00**. Again this is only operating hours and you should take into account that the applicant has stated he intends to employ up to five members of staff that would need to enter the site before operating hours. This would mean noise from staff entering, talking amongst staff and customers, moving of heavy machinery (boat moving equipment), boats running, heavy duty drills and other power tools would wake us up and prevent us from relaxing and enjoying our home and garden after work and well into the night. If this plan was to be approved we would request due to the nature of the business the hours be restricted from 09:00 to 17:00 Monday to Friday and no weekend or bank holiday business.
- 3) We purchased our property because we wanted to give our grandchildren the best possibility of enjoying nature and all that comes with it, especially our eldest grandson who suffers with **ASPERGERS SYNDROME**. Out in public our grandson has to use noise cancelling ear protectors to stop everything from becoming overwhelming for him. With this proposed change of use for a commercial marine workshop & boatyard, the constant noise this would create will force my grandson to suffer in our own gardens, Monday to Sunday in a place meant for he's escape. The application would see my grandson only be allowed to relax between the hours of 22:00 to 06:00.
- 4) The proposed application will also give access to the back of the applicants property, which runs along our private road, this road is separated only by a 5ft fence. We would have **no real protection** from any of their visitors. The type of business the applicant is also proposing could also give rise to break-ins as I am sure marina equipment and boats are quite expensive. For our safety to prevent any unwanted intruders being encouraged by the idea of expensive boats and/or equipment being stored onsite, if planning is approved we would request where the proposed site runs adjacent to our private access road be screened with a minimum 8ft solid fencing and anti-climbing top.
- 5) The applicants have also placed a **static mobile home** on our boundary line for their daughter and boyfriend to live in, we now have to live with them constantly looking in on us, making our as stated earlier ill grandson even more uncomfortable. We would ask that before any plans are approved this mobile home is moved to a more suitable location and any plans amended to fit this into them accordingly for the sake of our **privacy**.
- 6) There has been **no real tests** carried out to show how placing a marine workshop & boatyard into a location like ours will affect us or those around us. The noise **pollution** will be constant, and very loud, boats are built using tough materials and to drill through them would require very heavy duty

equipment. The exhausts on boats are designed to be operational under water, even in their natural environment the noise from the exhaust are loud, now take them out of the water and place them in a location designated as countryside. The applicant has also been posting to the local social media Facebook page that the marine business was being run from their previous property at downsviews with no complaints, this however has no merit as the location mentioned has **no residential dwellings** apart from their own.

7) The proposal also does not give enough consideration into the light pollution it would cause to the night skies of the **South Downs National Park** and all surrounding areas. 06:00 to 22:00 again is only operational hours and thus would mean the light pollution from staff entering and leaving the site will go on even past these times. There is no limit to the detrimental effect this could have on the wildlife that depend on the night skies of the **SDNP** night skies.

8) The proposed application aims to put storage containers even closer to my home, I implore anyone to come to the site and listen to the sound of the **container doors slamming closed** as people do not appreciate the way sound travels. We already have storage containers further up the site location, we have no need for more.

In regards to the proposed change of use being of importance to the area you first must look at the area, and if these businesses are required.

Firstly the need for a **martial arts gym**, if we take a handful of postcodes in the surrounding areas we can see how many gyms there are:

BN17 - 13 GYMS
BN3 - 19 GYMS
BN12 - 16 GYMS
BN16 - 14 GYMS
BN13 - 18 GYMS
BN11 - 15 GYMS
BN14 - 14 GYMS
BN41 - 19 GYMS
BN1 - 19 GYMS
RH20 - 6 GYMS
PO21 - 16 GYMS

All of these gyms are within a 4 mile radius of the postal area, which would be closer and more suitable than the proposed site. The importance of these referenced post codes is very significant because these are the postcodes of the letters of support which suggest there are no other classes in their area.

The application also wants to put **37 storage containers** on site, again you need to look at the needs to the community especially when moving away from the local plan and developing in land designated as countryside.

Within a 6 mile radius of this proposed site are no less than 4 major sites with the exact same business, one which has been approved to dramatically increase its number of containers, with this we have to ask how many more containers are needed in this area?

Lastly the applicant wants to put a **marine workshop & boatyard** on a site designated as countryside. The applicant has described the reason behind this being that they would not need to

have the same costs as other marine business that are coastal based, undercutting other local business that are more suitably located are not good enough grounds for moving away from local plans. The applicant also states that the size of the development should not be used as a guide for the size of the business, when in fact should be considered above all else, the businesses very own website clearly shows the size of this operation, so busy in fact that they consistently highlighted how busy they were with pictures showing boats piled up. The applicant also contracts in more members of staff to work on boats outside, thus completely contradicting the claim that boats are delivered "infrequently" and "typically only 2 boats per week..." The applicant has in their own words listed the marine company as running for 20 years, this is no small feat and in itself must make the company by no means small. The applicant also states their intention for growth, at the size they already are and their intention for growth it must be noted that they have already outgrown the proposed site size and should be located in a more suitable site that can handle such growth, whilst at the same time not being affected by such a business.

The applicant also states they advertised on Facebook for their greenhouses, this I find particularly strange that somebody with 20+ year's business experience would only advertise on one platform. I believe there is also a strong contradiction with the comments made, the applicant states they were visited but told the greenhouses were too old, again I find this odd that currently the applicant is advertising on the local Facebook page for help removing said greenhouses and rebuilding them in London, now they can't be that old if someone in London wants them. (I have a picture of the advert, just in case it's mistakenly deleted)

We would like to take this opportunity to highlight that other businesses in the area that still, like The Chalet have access to their agricultural/horticultural provisions have not completely abandoned them but simply adapted to work along them. Removing the greenhouses and placing a marine workshop and boatyard would be completely turning our backs on an industry that will especially now post Brexit be of even greater importance.