

Bronte Welham

From: Lisa Coney on behalf of Planning
Sent: 06 February 2017 08:54
To: Planning Scanning; Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning Application FG/198/16/PL - OBJECTION - 1, Sea Drive, Ferring

Sent: 05 February 2017 13:45
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application FG/198/16/PL - OBJECTION - 1, Sea Drive, Ferring

My name is Mrs Janice Royle of 108 Sea Lane, Ferring, West Sussex. This is the adjoining property in respect of the proposed development above.

I vehemently object to the nature of the proposals of planning application FG/198/16/PL and set out my objections accordingly below.

Biography of Purchase

I relocated from North West London in 2012 having purchased 108 Sea Lane, Ferring following the sudden loss of my husband, and father to our five children in 2011.

Without my husband, a complete change of living circumstances was required, as I am a disabled person. I have overcome professional medical opinion that I would never walk again following an operation, and have achieved limited mobility.

My family and I, had very specific requirements when relocating me from London....a semi-rural type property, as close to the sea as possible in a quiet location, without being overlooked in any way.

108 Sea Lane covered every aspect of my requirements.

Following my operation, quality of life is without doubt, of the utmost importance to me, as four of my five children remain in London for professional reasons.

I reside in a beautiful area, overlooking fields and the sea, where all the houses in the area are of a similar type, but have differing styles.

The neighbouring properties with the exception of "Blue Waters" all aesthetically meet the general streetscene in my immediate locality, and the village as a whole.

No.1 Sea Drive is no different to any other, and does not in any way detract from the street-scene of the area, quoted in the Planning Application.

Proposal / Planning Application

I object to living next to the proposed construction, that appears in excess of twice the size of the current building that was present, when I gave consideration to the purchase of my home, based on my ongoing quality of life.

It is not in any way acceptable for the proposed construction to have a Master Bedroom window directly in line with my primary bedroom window where I spend a significant amount of my time. I vehemently object to this being the case.

I am currently able to fall asleep at night enjoying the moonlight on a clear evening due to there being no external street lighting or any other form of light pollution in the immediate vicinity of my home. I can wake with the low winter sun rising through my open window. I strongly object to having those very amenities taken away from me, and having to close the blinds at night in order to avoid being kept awake by the light pollution from an apartment block.

The building line of the proposed construction is not in keeping with the area, nor in consideration with the lines of my property, as it is situated much further forward towards Sea Lane.

Its building line passes directly across my primary bedroom window within metres and is detrimental to my residential amenity issue, of unnecessarily overlooking my bedroom and this is absolutely unacceptable. Should my disability deteriorate in line with medical opinion and I become confined to my bedroom, I object to the very reason I purchased my property, being taken from me, and my quality of life being significantly affected in the long term.

I may face the need to deal with carers, and other such professionals going forward.

I absolutely and most strongly object, to motor vehicles and motor bikes (for which provision has been made in said application) coming and going all hours of the day, and with headlights at night on full beam, directly under my bedroom window.

It is not acceptable for me to have to tolerate the noise, light and air pollution that will be brought about by this proposal.

I vehemently object to not being in a position to open my bedroom window when I choose, without the smell of petrol or diesel filling my home even in the slightest, and the noise that parking vehicles and/or motorbikes under my window, will create.

I strongly object to the proposal of a Bin Store under my main bedroom window and in close proximity to my lounge window and my rear doors.

This will cause significant disturbance at any given time of day or night, as well as unacceptable odours in the summer months that I should not have to tolerate.

This will have the added and increased hazard, of attracting vermin such as more foxes and rats.

Residents' movement cannot be controlled, and therefore I strongly object to the use of motion sensor lighting, activating all hours of the night, and activated either by residents or animals moving in both parking and bin areas.

I also object to having a Council Refuse truck pulling up in the dark on early mornings in the winter, with its bright lights flashing under my bedroom window. I object to having to tolerate the noise whilst they empty a minimum of eight bins or possibly a number of wheely skips. Further consideration must be given every other week, when the potential of sixteen bins, to include Recycling, is scheduled to be emptied.

I object to the light pollution through both my windows to the south side of my property which will be obliterated by the shadow of the proposed building, as well as its first floor construction being entirely visible from inside my home. Any suggestion therefore, of a higher boundary to eradicate such an overbearing view from downstairs, will only further exacerbate my right to light.

This proposal will have significant visual effect to the rear southern aspect of my property from my garden. It will mean that the skyline looking south will be entirely filled between my house and my garage with the first floor of this proposed construction. I object to my privacy and quality of life being eradicated in this manner.

I have a further objection to the change to three quarters of my established southern boundary, which will be devastated by the redevelopment of the site.

There is provision in the application for only ten car parking spaces for sixteen bedrooms. It is fair to say, that most families in the modern era have two cars.

On this basis, I strongly object that the proposal will cause significant further parking issues in the area by potentially only allowing for 50% of the properties to have two cars, therefore taking up eight spaces. This, whilst banking that the other four properties only have two cars between them.

There is no parking available on Sea Lane, nor in Sea Drive, and from April to October there is very little or no parking available, on the beachfront or between the fields on Goring Gap.

What is currently available is now subject to a limited period stay, because of recent ongoing parking problems that were experienced in the immediate vicinity.

I further object to the issue being the cause of recent events in the summer, whereby I have found visitors to the area, parking on my private in & out driveway, and then pleading ignorance.

I absolutely and utterly object to the ridiculous proposal of a new Highway Access onto Sea Lane, some three or four metres from my own driveway, on a complete blind spot.

Because of the blind spot, on any given day the safest way to ensure passage onto Sea Lane from St Malo Close for example (the rear access to and from my property) is to watch and count the cars heading west along the beach towards Blue Waters.

The driver exiting, is then able to count the cars past the junction in order to exit safely.

Cars travel far too fast for this area. Visitors to the area do not recognise the dangers and do not see my in & out driveway, until they are on top of it.

When exiting St Malo Close looking south down Sea Lane, once a car comes into view from the blind spot at the North East corner of 1 Sea Drive travelling at around 30mph, it is on top of the junction in just five seconds. Most drivers accelerate significantly having rounded the bend at Blue Waters heading North, and are then on top of the St Malo Close junction from the blind spot in around three seconds.

The planning diagrams showing the road are not at all representative of the blind spot exiting my property at the front, when parked facing south on my driveway. Firstly in the summer, the fields of the Gap and the verge opposite Sea Lane are left to grow, to a height whereby the ability to see what is coming along the beach is entirely removed.

It is with this in mind that I completely object, to myself, my family and my visitors being put at significant risk of a collision when exiting my driveway, with a car exiting the proposed new development.

The driver of a car exiting North(left) onto Sea Lane from the new development access is likely to be doing what many people commonly do when exiting left, they'll be looking right, at the bend, to see what is coming North. If they choose to try and beat an oncoming car around the bend at Blue Water exiting left from the new development access with accelerating pace, as someone exits South from my property, there will be no more than a single second of reaction time, to avoid a significant head-on collision.

Consideration of the Area

I accept change and I respect and appreciate progression to a degree.

I could accept for example, a development of three single story bungalows on the site, completely in keeping with the local area and having a significantly reduced impact on my home.

So I also strongly object to this entire development therefore, as the character of the proposal does not in any way relate, to the surrounding area.

Blue Waters is, and due to the very nature of its waterside location on the beachfront itself, considered to be a complete one off.

It is not and never has been, in keeping with its surroundings and it does not in any way enhance the street-scene.

It is a building of nine dwellings, few of which are occupied more than a small number of weeks a year. Because of the parking issue in the area, it has underground parking for eighteen cars I believe(?) which appears to be the provision of two per dwelling. There must always be at least one spare space underground, as the owner of the property on the South East corner believes that on the days that they visit their second home, the little car park on the beach beside Blue Waters is his own private space, in order that he can see his Jaguar from his window.

Blue Waters have generally been properties of an investment nature, second homes or holiday lets. This proposal, may be no different and I vehemently object to my quality of life and the amenities that I benefit from, being affected in this way, when this development cannot be considered as necessary.

These properties cannot be considered as "affordable" for young local people, or elderly members of the community.

There are currently a significant number of flats available in the immediate area, all of which could be considered, affordable. Yet they remain unsold.

With addition to the flats having been approved at Beehive Lane taking the number available locally to over twenty, I absolutely object to the notion that the local development plan needs to take the number of two bedroom flats available within a quarter mile radius, to in excess of thirty.

Ferring needs affordable housing, for younger couples, and/or young professionals, in my opinion. Even if the local authority and its plans wish to exclude the elderly if it considers the current population too high, it should provide some more affordable bungalows, for a slightly younger generation.

There is a significant degree of wildlife on The Gap, that must also be given consideration. An increase in vermin drawn to the immediate vicinity will endanger many of the ground birds and wildlife that have increased in the area. I note many more people opposite my home, photographing birds and other such animals, which proves the benefit to not over developing.

Summary

I object in the strongest possible terms, to the very reason I purchased 108 Sea Lane, being taken from me. It will affect my quality of life and the amenities I hold dear on many levels.

I purchased a property that stands in the vicinity of a number of well presented houses. No.1 Sea Drive is not an exception to this statement.

Had I wanted to live next to an apartment block, I could well have chosen many other locations to live, rather than Ferring.

This will have a significant impact on the value of my home, and it will have a bearing on my children's decisions in respect of the property, in years to come. I object to someone believing they have the right to effect myself and my family in this way without due consideration.

I vehemently object that despite the fact, that I do not own a view, it can be taken away by someone, who can then charge a premium, for somebody else not to own it either.

I also object in the strongest possible terms, that the home I have fallen in love with despite never expecting to find, along with my quality of life, can immediately be changed and become something entirely different, based upon nothing more than the greed of a vendor and a developer, for their own financial gain and nothing more.

Yours sincerely
Mrs Janice Royle
108 Sea Lane
Ferring BN12 5HB

