

## Ronnie McGregor

---

**From:** Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses  
**Sent:** 17 August 2018 09:26  
**To:** Planning Scanning  
**Subject:** FW: FP/171/18PL

---

**From:** Sue Bowley On Behalf Of Planning  
**Sent:** 16 August 2018 16:27  
**To:** Planning.Responses  
**Subject:** FW: FP/171/18PL

Sue Bowley | PA to Director of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Visit Arun's web site at [www.arun.gov.uk](http://www.arun.gov.uk)



Save the environment - think before you print.

---

**From:** Robert Crichton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 August 2018 11:03  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FP/171/18PL

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

Objection raised by Robert Crichton 5 Wellers Close, Felpham Date of objection 18/08/2018

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, trees and interesting vegetation which provides a valuable food source for wildlife, birds of prey are frequently seen hovering over the land searching for food. 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 a biodiversity for wildlife.

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. The current plans would impact on the surrounding properties, potentially increasing their flood risk.

4....The proposed plans do not show sufficient space allocated for parking vehicles. This will result in cars being parked on roads adjacent to the proposed site and result in congestion and neighbourhood unrest. Having considered the parking arrangements in the plans it appears totally inadequate. For example one bedroom housed

with one parking space does not allow for the contingency that a couple in these properties could have a car each, where do they park the second car? We have had experience of this, living in a development which had insufficient parking allocation due to households having more than one car but only one parking space. Residents then have no choice they need to park their car somewhere which leads to parking in other peoples spaces and using the visitors spaces. This caused much stress and conflict between neighbours. There are already parking issues on the development. Cars are already parked on dangerous corners.

The estate roads are not designed to meet current volume of traffic and people parking on these roads add to the chaos. In particular driving into the estate is currently already a challenge as cars parking make the road single track. This is especially dangerous at the ridiculously designed right angled corners at junctions where you cant see oncoming traffic until you are on the corner. An accident is only a matter of time. I myself have had near misses. The further plans for the development would compound this problem, increasing the danger to residents and visitors.

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, increasing flooding risks and the unsuitability and density of the development is out of keeping with the surrounding homes. And therefore will be a detriment to the surrounding area.

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,

Robert Crichton