

From: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 July 2020 14:57
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Planning Application - FG/6/20/PL

Neighbour consultation please upload

Andrew Wood MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Department

T: 01903 737768
E: andrew.wood@arun.gov.uk

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

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



Sent: 06 July 2020 21:02
To: Andrew Wood <Andrew.Wood@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application - FG/6/20/PL

Hello Mr Wood.

I am emailing you as it appears the comments I wish to make regarding this application have too many characters so can not be submitted via the planning application website.

I have reviewed the Acoustics report submitted by WADARS as part of this planning application and would like to comment upon its contents as I believe the report contains anomalies which if corrected would change the conclusion

of the report. I am also worried this report may be being accepted as factually correct, thus leading others to base further decisions on that, when they should not.

My first point is this survey was undertaken to support the WADARS planning application so should not be seen as a true representation of all the facts as it will only focus on those that add support. It has to be viewed as a report bias towards WADARS planning application.

The reports itself seems to base its case on 'computer modelling', within 'limited scenario's' based on 'perceived dog barking' levels. This does not allow for a full understanding of what the noise disturbance really will be. This is weakened further by the fact only one site visit was made on the 13th of May using reference data gathered for just one hour. To have given a true reflection visits should also have been made at other time periods, especially if the report was to include data for these periods. One particularly questionable assumption is only the 10db drop in background noise at night. This is totally incorrect as background noise levels at night can be next to nil with the possible exclusion of occasional wildlife. Due to the importance of night-time levels especially on the possible effect of disturbed sleep, the report results based on these assumptions for night-time periods should be ignored.

The assumption the dog barks will be 'typically short and shape' and that they always sleep at night seems to be an extremely optimistic viewpoint. Dogs are pack animals so when one barks this triggers the others to bark and then it goes in a vicious circle around the dogs for some time. We are not looking at a short sharp disturbances here but prolonged one.

The report also implies the overnight care of the dogs is dependent on people living on site so would require approval for the living accommodation to be built. This would be very much against the development plan for the area and be inconsistent with the recent ruling on White Lodge (A/32/20/PL) which is in the same development area, just a few meters away. Does the dependency between the two mean, no accommodation approval, no kennel approval?

The report states 'Whilst elements of the equestrian centre may be considered as receptors as part of the assessment process. It is queried as to what level of sound stimulus/disturbance might cause interference with either a riding lessons or horse behaviour, as these are unknown areas with minimal published material' – Does this mean that because this can't be modelled this issue is being ignored as it is fundamental to the health and safety of both the horses and the riders and should be a priority consideration as part of this assessment.

The biggest problem with this report is it does not in any way address the issues of the neighbourhood especially with the use of incorrect assumptions that could without too much effort actually have been checked. But then correct information may not have produced the required conclusion the report was commissioned for.

In Conclusion I still have three major objections to the introduction of the kennels at the WADARS site which I don't believe have been properly addressed by this report or any other articles related to this planning application I have seen.

- 1) The introduction of the kennels will produce significant noise pollution to the neighbourhood, simply based on the fact the background noise in the area for the majority of the time is extremely low. This means the increase in noise will be extremely noticeable and therefore be a disturbance.
- 2) I also believe the extent of this noise disturbance to the larger neighbourhood is being underestimated. If in the area of Wadars at evenings and weekends it is possible to hear the trains at more than half a mile away, as stated in the report. Will the housing on the A259 and in Ferring north of the railway line also now be getting the disturbance of the dogs barking? If noise travels one way it can travel the other. Are these residents aware of the planning application and the effect it could have on them?
- 3) This is my biggest concern. At no point in the report or in any other correspondence I have seen, has the Health and Safety issue been answered around the dangers to both horse and riders at Hangleton Equestrian. A sudden sharp bark is known to spook horses as many a rider can confirm. Should such an accident occur who will be liable? Will it be WADARS for installing the kennels, or the council for approving the plans? As we are looking at an accident waiting to happen here.

I hope you understand my concerns based on my review comments made and the need to at least address the three items in my conclusion before any planning consent to this application is given

Thank you

Ian Parkes