

Sandra Edwards

From: Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning
Sent: 12 May 2017 17:47
To: Planning.Responses; Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: FG/198/16/PL 1 Sea Drive, Ferring, West Sussex BN12 5HD

Nicola Spencer | Technical Support Manager, Planning Department, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre,
Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Craig Savage [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2017 15:54
To: Planning
Subject: FG/198/16/PL 1 Sea Drive, Ferring, West Sussex BN12 5HD

Ref: From 108, Sea Lane, Ferring, BN12 5HB

Time Sent: 15:54pm

I have noted the time of this email above, as I am aware that today is the final day to submit representation in respect of the above.

My recent objections and my views have not in any way changed in respect of the above, and now I have had time to assess the most recent submissions in respect of this absolute farce. This entire proposal contravenes so many stipulations laid down by local government.

I note that the application has now revised the number of allocated parking bays....downwards! It is absolutely unacceptable for just nine spaces to service sixteen bedrooms, without provision for service vehicles, visitors etc. Which in short, indicates very clearly to me that the developer is very happy to leave any additional overflow of cars/vans etc to just park wherever the owner/driver chooses in the vicinity, causing all

manner of problems and potential accident flashpoints. The underground car park that has been added, shows quite clearly that when all the spaces are in use, it will be a monumental challenge to manouver a car of any reasonable size, in or out of bay seven or eight.

I note that the developer has realised the error of his ways by no longer suggesting an opening onto Sea Lane which was highly dangerous indeed, but now has applied for two access points on Sea Drive within a few feet of each other(?), and directly opposite the ramp for Blue Waters. All three of which, will merge onto a single width road, which is equally unsatisfactory and also just as dangerous. What are they thinking? This is a hyperthetical question of course, as this highlights that the developer is really struggling with this matter, and has clearly demonstrated the obvious issue with this entire proposal.....it does not work on so many levels!

As an aside, but relevant, I propose that the local council make the small car park next to BlueWaters entirely spaces for the disabled, as the able bodied have spaces all the way along Marine Drive. It would also stop BlueWaters residents using it as their own private car park when they already have one. Let them walk along the beach in the rain if they dont wish to park in their flooded underground spaces.

I am incensed beyond all comprehension to note that the revision seems to indicate that the building is that much higher than the original application. This was something that also happened with BlueWaters and for good reason I believe, so this clearly indicates that the same concerns in respect to water levels are a legitimate recognised issue in respect of this proposal. The effects to my property could be catastrophic after

a development of this nature, and that alone is not something I will accept in any way.

This overbearing monstrosity of a building that was already an issue highlighted in my original representations, has just become a whole lot more of a potential eyesore for me. Facing my property and especially my bedroom window, the revised proposal shows with its raising in height, that there would be excessively bright common way lights and a door entrance, both of which will be illuminated entirely through the hours from dusk until dawn. This will be further exacerbated by the increase in height of the building. The ridiculously bright lights that illuminate the doorway to BlueWaters, let alone from one right next door, cause a huge degree of light pollution that is clearly visible from my own driveway. The current property is not illuminated in this way at night and does not therefore produce huge levels of light pollution in close proximity to my bedroom, as the proposed development would do. I vehemently object to the fact that this is something that should even be suggested, that I tolerate for a moment.

This is without considering any boundary lighting to the development, which I note has not been shown on the application at all. I doubt it is going to be left in darkness is it? It is proposed that I would have ten sets of windows facing my bedroom, four of which are double doors and/or juliet balconies. This is absolutely unacceptable to me.

Why is it considered acceptable for me to have to change the way I live(?). It is a lifestyle that I have invested into heavily in financial terms, in order that I can enjoy my well earned retirement. Not so two other parties driven by nothing more than greed can benefit financially, whilst others have to lose their amenities, without any redress whatsoever.

I highlighted in my previous representation that the developer has just passed off the wildlife issue by ticking boxes marked NO, and has clearly not since addressed this matter. Why has this gone, without redress?

Be under no illusion that I vehemently object to any proposal of this nature being developed within a few metres of my home, overlooking my bedroom, polluting my home with light, removing my amenities that I have come to thoroughly enjoy and destroying my quality of life. In recent days a neighbour did some work that lasted less than a day, and which was entirely acceptable to me, despite whatever was being carried out, reverberating through my home. Yet I am expected when predominantly housebound, to put up with all the noise, heavy plant, drilling, banging, smells, dust, tradesmans vans parked everywhere and become a prisoner in my own home without being able to open windows and doors, that a development of this size and nature will create.

I am now prepared to take this matter significantly further than it currently stands, and am now seeking legal advice, in regards to my position and the entire process of this application in respect of all parties involved.

Mrs. Janice Royle
108 Sea Lane
Ferring
BN12 5HB

