

-----Original Message-----

From: Sally Arnhold [REDACTED]

Sent: 18 August 2016 22:33

To: Karl Roberts
[REDACTED]

Subject: Planning Application for Barfoot's of Botley, Sefter Farm P/76/16/PL

I would like to object to this planning application for the following reasons:

INCREASED NOISE generated

INCREASED TRAFFIC on the Pagham Road

INCREASED ENCROACHMENT on Rookery Farm, our Grade II listed farmhouse, by what has changed from a small farm with two warehouses, to a gigantic industrial, sometimes smelly, complex straddling the landscape.

INCREASED ENCROACHMENT

Our house has enjoyed an amazing open outlook to the South Downs, Halnaker Windmill, Chichester Cathedral etc for over the last 300 years. Barfoot's, the newcomer, with its piecemeal developments, is slowly eroding the pleasure of that view.

When Advaco, Barfoot's agent, mention in their Landscape&Visual Impact Assessment that they want to "create new, large scale tree and hedgerow framework which compliments the open landscape, whilst maintaining significant views of Chichester Cathedral, the South Downs and local features." it is vital that Rookery Farm is referred to and as guardians of this historic landmark, we are visited, consulted and you can see the landscape and views from our perspective.

It's easy to promise and draw artistic impressions of the proposed landscaping, but unless it's maintained-watered and dead trees replaced,-it's worthless. Eg Screening promised for the Anaerobic Digester P/92/08, which incidentally turned out to be larger than the plans we were originally shown, is still ineffective and struggling years later.

Who's responsible for policing these conditions? It would be interesting to look at the artistic impressions of the landscaping, from the various planning applications and compare them to what's actually there now!

With regard to the "significant views" Advaco mentions, why hasn't ADC insisted that these latest large structures are built to the north of Sefter Farm, where they're more out of sight and it's less populated?... instead, for example,

building a greenhouse, a gigantic eyesore, right beside the Pagham Road, the main artery for residents and tourists to visit the sea and Pagham Nature Reserve?

INCREASED TRAFFIC ON THE PAGHAM ROAD

There seems to be discrepancies between traffic survey figures of the Pagham Road. A robust, independent, comprehensive one is required measuring traffic on the Pagham Road, including in and out of Barfoot's, defining what is meant by a visit/journey. Is it in and out or just one way?...in which case the figures need to be doubled assuming all traffic visiting Barfoot's, leaves it as well. This survey should be 24 hours, 7 days a week in spring, summer, autumn and winter. Only then can a measured decision, based on accurate statistics, be made as to whether Pagham Road is really one of the most dangerous and busiest B roads in West Sussex, as is so often quoted and whether Barfoot's predicted vehicle figures stack up.

Thank you for informing us about this planning application by putting the notice on the fence at the end of our drive. However to the passers by, it gives the impression it's a planning application to do with Farmgate Cottage only. Strangely, the last two applications from Barfoot's were displayed in the school holidays when some residents would have been away and on a telegraph pole on the road where it was too dangerous to stop. I feel that the majority of residents are unaware of these planning applications or feel powerless to stop them.

I feel ADC is biased in favour of Barfoot's when negotiating their planning applications and amendments, but the residents also deserve a say and fair treatment. You have a duty to defend them against a dangerous road and an encroaching employer, which is affecting our and our families wellbeing and peaceful enjoyment of our homes and surroundings.

Sally Arnhold

Sent from my iPad