

CLERK Mrs. M S BLAND

16/11/09

**Planning Dept
Arun District Council
Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton
W. Sussex
BN17 5LF**

Dear Sir

**APPLICATION FN/56/09 EXTENSION TO EXISTING CARAVAN SITE
LONG FURLONG, FINDON PROVISION OF 14 No. TOURING CARAVAN
PITCHES ERECTION OF 2 BUILDINGS FOR TOILETS ETC.**

The site of this application is a sensitive one being prominent to view and set in the approaches to Findon Village and is within the AONB. The current site for 5 caravans is a comparatively recent development adjacent to the established area of Findon cricket club, 3 rural houses including a small cattery business and is known as a local beauty spot. Findon Parish Council (FPC) and residents were unable to make observations on this development because it seems planning consent is not required for sites of up to 5 caravans.

We strongly object to this application which increases the current use of the area by nearly 3 times the number of caravans with 2 permanent buildings included, all having a greatly increased intrusive impact on the surrounding countryside when viewed from adjacent footpaths, the A280 Long Furlong and high points in the local area. The proposals do not in anyway enhance the areas essential character and environmental assets as required of the Local Plan.

In our view, the proposed development does not qualify as a 'quiet informal recreational use' of the site as allowed in the ADLP having regard to the considerable increase in the number of people, cars and activity noise, and neither does it qualify as a rural diversification since the area is not intensively farmed and employment opportunities are not contemplated (See Q20 application form)

The Design and access statement accompanying the application refers to several documents purporting to support this development, namely PP7- The Good Practice Guide on planning for tourism, the SE Plan- policies C3 and TSR5, also ADLP Pol

DEV 39. However, all these policy documents (with the exception of ADLP DEV 39) also state an over riding factor that proposals must not harm the landscape quality and requires rural landscape to be protected, both essential in the AONB.

With regard to ADLP Pol DEV 39 clause (ii) accepts a proposal replacing an existing site but subject to there being no expansion of the site areas, therefore this application does not comply.

Having regard to all these factors, we consider this application to be totally inappropriate for the area. It will be very intrusive in the landscape and the AONB and will create a precedent for further expansion in the future.

In our opinion, the proposals are contrary to ADLP Policies GEN1; GEN27; AREA 9 clause (ii) and DEV39 clause ii; and does not comply with the overriding requirement of the SE Plan requiring protection of the countryside.

For all the reasons recorded above, we request that this application be refused.

Yours faithfully

Mrs. M S Bland
Clerk FPC