

[REDACTED]

From: DARREN MILLS [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 October 2016 15:39
To: David Easton
Subject: Fwd: PLANNING APPLICATION WA/63/16/PL - FAIRMEAD FARM BINSTED

Dear Mr Easton,

Apologies, I sent you the draft not the final copy of my letter. please use the letter below as my final copy for Arun District Council and for use on the planning site.

Kind regards

Darren Mills

-----Original message-----

[REDACTED]

Date : 05/10/2016 - 14:51 (GMTDT)
To : david.easton@arun.gov.uk
Subject : PLANNING APPLICATION WA/63/16/PL - FAIRMEAD FARM BINSTED

Dear Mr Easton,

I am writing to you regarding my objection to the planning application WA/63/16/PL.

I would like to bring to your attention a number of issues regarding the application set out by Rural Associates on behalf of Mrs Osborne.

In section 1. Background 1.1: It clearly states that the family business operates from Blackmill Cottage inside the South Downs National Park. This is in fact incorrect as after checking on the South Downs National Park website the address given is outside of the South Downs National Park. In the same section it also states that the equipment used to carry out the works is large. This being the case I believe the equipment mentioned will be too wide for the narrow winding lane leading to the proposed site.

In Appendix 2: There is a spread sheet detailing the sizes of the equipment to be stored and used on a daily basis. I am concerned about the details and feel these need to be checked prior to a decision being made by Arun District Council. The first item on the list a Tractor 85hp lists its measurements in the order of length followed by width, but all the other items are listed in the reverse order, width then length. This may seem picky of me but if there is an error on the application it could be that we have a tractor of 2.75mtr width not length. This would be highly unacceptable to use in this area. The fact that Binsted Lane is 2.5mtr wide and the average car is 1.8mtr wide even with a safe passing distance between two vehicles this would calculate to over 4.5mtrs, 2mtrs more than the road width.

There are no street lights or pavements only very soft narrow verges with deep ditches each side of the lane. Even in the summer the verges are very soft and in the winter they become very boggy. Last winter I had to tow three of my customers cars on separate days off the verges near the church as they had become stuck while moving over for passing traffic. If larger vehicles are involved someone will end up in the ditch not just stuck on a verge.

All the equipment listed are 2mtrs or over even the quad bike which leads me to believe that its just not safe for this type of business to operate from the location applied for. The lane is winding, narrow and with little or no passing places apart from private drives or field gateways, none of which are suitable for the passing of as stated LARGE vehicles. The lane is used by many walkers, cyclists, horse riders and dog walkers myself included. I am the manager of the kennel next door owned by Mrs Withers and we walk all the customers dogs in the lane. My customers bring their dogs to us because its a quiet and safe area. I feel this would not be the case if this application is passed. I would have grave concerns for the health and safety of myself, my staff and my customers and their dogs.

In section 2 Justification: It states Mr Osborne was hoping to obtain planning consent based on the past use of the site and to replace the existing buildings. The site itself has not been used for over 30 years other than when Mr Pearce the previous owner left a bus there with the plan to renovate it as stated in section 1.2. The bus was left there for two years then removed, never undergoing any renovation work. So as a working business this has not been the case for many decades and I wonder how long a piece of small land of 2.3 acres can be left unused before any application has to be treated as a new build not a renovation ?

Appendix 3 Planning History: The photo copy dated 1954 supplied by Rural Associates and Mrs Osborne is also very misleading at first glance. It talks of Fairmead Farm as a whole but this farm site has been split and sold of in various stages over the years, therefore is not a working farm but just a field. All the main buildings except one as I understand have been purchased by my mother in law Mrs Withers and Mrs Cleal a past neighbour but still the land owner of the lower field. The main house and one building is now Bee Bee Kennels, the second is now my house Dawnwood and the two large barns or 100ft piggeries as stated also belong to Mrs Withers which I use as a workshop, extra storage for the kennels and a garage. Therefore I am not sure why this has been included in their application.

It would seem that they plan to place a very large barn on the site not even on the original foot print and of a height and style not in keeping with the surrounding area or properties, two of which are listed buildings within 100mtrs of the application site. They also plan to erect security lighting on the said site which is very close to the Dark Skies corridor for the Arun District which would cause a great deal of light pollution.

The storage of diesel vehicles on this site will also be damaging to the local environment and biodiversity of the area. Run off rainwater on this side of the lane makes its way to the small stream to the east of the application site. The damage that could be done to the local area may be irreversible, as is the damage I fear that has already taken place on the site due to Mrs Osborne clearing and removing the roof to the barn with out any surveys taking place prior to the work. I know there are bats and barn owls using the application site for hunting and I believe there may have been bats roosting on site but I'm afraid any evidence of that may now be gone.

I also believe the plan for the business known as Sussex Boreholes and prospect of increasing the size of said business will have detrimental effect not only to this outstanding part of Sussex but to the local people of this parish and the many people that love to visit the peace and quite of the countryside. None of the local residents of Binsted would dream of running this kind of practice or business in this area, so I ask myself and Arun District Council why should a company such as Sussex Boreholes as that is what we are talking about here, be allowed to do just that, a large possibly expanding business not a few sheep.

I would like to finish by saying that I believe Sussex Boreholes (Mrs Osborne) wishes to move what I consider to be an Industrial business not Agricultural business, away from her own doorstep only to place it somewhere else. Mrs Osborne has an equal amount of land elsewhere including the site its currently on which has a straight and wider lane 0.2miles from the A27 not a narrow twisting lane 2.3miles long in. Therefore I ask Arun Council to reject this application on this and many of the grounds I have stated above.

Kind regards

Darren Mills