

Objection to FP/171/18/PL Erection of 18 dwellings on land at Stanhorn Grove Felpham

Objection raised by J. Boulton 23 Bridger Close Felpham PO22 8FT

Date of objection 07/08/2018

Dear Mr Davis

I strongly object to this proposal for the reasons listed below-

1....There appears to be confusion with the exact size of the plot. Two different figures have been quoted. However, even the larger of the two numbers is insufficient in size to build 18 dwellings with adequate parking facilities. It is proposed to build these 18 homes on an area which is positioned between small developments of four and five bedroom houses and consequently the planned development with its high density of housing will be totally out of keeping with the surrounding homes.

2....The area of land for the proposed development is a beautiful small meadow comprising of grasses, bushes and interesting vegetation. Deer are frequently seen on the land and bats fly from the trees at night and it is of course the home to much more wildlife. This land needs to be preserved as an oasis of nature and tranquility and not given over to yet more housing.

3....This proposed development is on meadowland which is very low lying. In winter standing water can be seen on it almost all the time. There is a ditch on the perimeter of one side which is often full to overflowing during spells of wet weather. Your proposals do not appear to make adequate provision for building 18 houses on an area which has the potential to flood frequently.

4....The proposed plans do not show sufficient space to park vehicles. There will be a need to park at least 24 cars as a minimum possibly 36. This will result in cars being parked on roads adjacent to the proposed site and result in congestion and neighbourhood unrest.

5....There are tree preservation orders on at least two trees on the perimeter of the site. Both orders have been upheld in recent tree felling applications. The plans do not appear to have taken these into account. Only one tree is shown.

In summary my objections are these. Building 18 houses without adequate parking, taking away a small meadowland of natural beauty, flooding risks and the unsuitability and density of the development compared to surrounding homes.

I therefore object to the proposed plans and ask that you take the issues outlined above into consideration when you review the proposal.

Yours sincerely

J. Boulton