

[REDACTED]

From: Daun Johnson on behalf of Planning
Sent: 21 September 2026 08:04
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: FTAO Hebe Smith - Planning application comment FG/87/26/PL



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>



From: Stephen Abbott [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 September 2026 15:25
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FTAO Hebe Smith - Planning application comment FG/87/26/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 Hebe, please find attached below a submission (OBJECTION) on behalf of Ferring Conservation Group which I have been unable to submit on the portal in relation to :-

FG/87/26/PL

42 Sea Lane Ferring BN12 5EH

Demolition of the existing dwelling and garages and erection of 4 No. terraced dwellings at the site's frontage, and 2 No. detached dwellings at the rear. Access from Sea Lane. Replacement garage to serve No.36 Sea Lane Gardens. In CIL Zone 4 and is CIL Liable as new dwellings.

Name Ferring Conservation Group
Address Stephen Abbott
239 Goring Way
Worthing
BN12 5BX

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

For / against : Object

Comment -

The proposal for 6 new dwellings to replace the existing single property on this site includes provision for only 12 car parking spaces to serve 6 multi occupancy dwellings with no immediate highway parking availability. The density of the proposal means that with all parking spaces occupied at the front of the site, the only option for turning large vehicles will be to move to the rear (west end of the site) which is restrictive in width and length. This is due to the over density of development on the site and forces all large vehicles to pass unacceptably close to the side of the property identified as plot 1 with no indicated segregated footway. Pedestrians and cyclists will be required to share the available access roadway with vehicles accessing the rear 3 bedroom family homes and rear gardens of the terraced properties or using the limited turning space available. This brings inherent safety concerns.

Egress from the site remains a restricted view on an often busy road frequently used by visitors to the seafront and village. A 'build-out' was created by WSCC Highways following a serious incident on a junction a little further south on Sea Lane where visibility exiting a side road was also limited. Vehicles trying to enter the development may be forced to unexpectedly stop in the carriageway if another vehicle is manoeuvring or attempting to exit the site, even allowing for the increased width referred to in the design statement. This is especially likely where a large vehicle is parked at the front of the site or exiting due to the oblique angle approaching the exit.

Cars exiting the parking bays assigned to plots 1 and 2 will likely encroach the 'no dig' root protection area indicated on the ground plan due to limited space to manoeuvre to achieve an exit in forward gear onto the highway (as would large vehicles coming from the rear of the site).

When the parking spaces for plot 4 are occupied, any vehicle reversing from the plot 3 parking provision will need to make multiple manoeuvres across the entrance, potentially prohibiting any vehicle attempting to enter the site from doing so.

We have concerns at the proposed loss of a significant number of trees in what is currently a good sized mature garden in a semi rural location which would support a wide variety of native wildlife. The application would make very intensive use of the site which must lead to substantial loss of biodiversity.

Apart from the suggestion for the installation of a few bat boxes in a limited bat survey, there is little or no mitigation for this loss and we do not feel there has been a meaningful environmental impact survey of this site.

We have particular worries regarding the very large and mature Copper Beech tree at the front of the site which is covered by a TPO, as well as the equally mature and healthy Monterey Pine tree located in what is currently the garden of 36 Sea Lane Gardens, and also the Red Cedar tree in the rear garden of 42 Sea Lane. In the arboriculture report, there is reference to Root Protection Areas and the proposed use of rafting in any construction, but all three of these trees with large root runs are at risk, and potential issues with these roots could easily lead to insurance claims for property damage further down the line. In particular, the proposed new car port to be constructed in what is now the garden of 36 Sea Lane Gardens and also the proposed car port for plots 5 and 6 are both perilously close to the Monterey Pine and the Western Red Cedar respectively.

In conclusion,

1. the increased traffic movements potentially associated with 6 new densely configured dwellings raises safety risks to pedestrians and cyclists within the development area and with vehicles exiting the site and other road users.
2. the proposed over development of the site with family style homes does not adequately cater for parking provision. Under Arun Parking Standards, the LHA would expect a

development of this size and location to provide 15 car parking spaces, with one additional car parking space for visitors, requiring 16 car parking spaces in total. Consequently, the parking provision represents a shortfall of four car parking spaces which cannot be accommodated due to the overdevelopment of the site as proposed.

3. The applicants have failed to provide any ecological appraisal despite the site being a well-stocked, mature garden opposite a designated Local Wildlife Site. Such an appraisal would likely raise further issues resulting from such overly intense development in such close proximity to the Ferring / Goring Gap.
4. we believe that the application in its current form would result in unacceptable and irreversible damage to the local biodiversity and, in particular, the mature trees that we have identified.

We urge Officers to refuse this proposal in its present form and density.

Regards,

Stephen Abbott (for Ferring Conservation Group)