

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 12 October 2016 09:21
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Objection to Planning Application WA/63/16/PL - Fairmead Farm Binsted Lane ArundelBN18 0LQ

From: David Easton
Sent: 12 October 2016 09:05
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection to Planning Application WA/63/16/PL - Fairmead Farm Binsted Lane ArundelBN18 0LQ

Please upload as a letter of rep.

From: Julia Plumstead [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 October 2016 10:51
To: David Easton
Subject: Objection to Planning Application WA/63/16/PL - Fairmead Farm Binsted Lane ArundelBN18 0LQ

Dear Mr Easton

Reference: planning application WA/63/16/PL - Demolition of 3 No. existing agricultural buildings & erection of new agricultural building & farm workshop/office.

This email is to lodge my objection to the above planning application because of the commercial enterprise that the applicant proposes to run from the site: namely to run an agricultural contractor business using large specialist vehicles which will cause significant road congestion and provide major concerns to the pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Binsted Lane is unsuitable for the vehicles that are proposed by the applicant. It is a narrow, twisting lane, with high hedges giving restricted visibility on the bends and narrow to non-existent grass verges which are often waterlogged in winter. There are a limited number of passing places along its length, some of which are driveways and field entrances.

The applicant has stated there will be 6-8 vehicle movements in an average working day which could be as frequent as 1 vehicle per hour. With no operational hours stated on the application form the business could be operating over weekends and 24 hours a day. The applicant also intends to expand the business which can only mean an increase in the number of vehicle movements and potentially the size of the vehicles to those stated in the application which makes the proposed usage of the site even more unacceptable. The lane is already heavily used by the existing farm traffic and the very substantial number of presumably authorised HGV movements operated by the transport business at Marsh Farm. The proposed additional traffic would be dangerous and detrimental to Binsted's narrow and winding lane as well as its historic landscape. It should be noted that the boundary of the South Downs National Park runs through the village and the applicant site is only a few metres from the boundary.

Due to its rural nature, beautiful and peaceful countryside, the lane is heavily used for recreational purposes: walking groups, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders during the week and at weekends. There are no footpaths along the lane and therefore walkers have to walk in the lane

and are limited in where they can stand safely for passing traffic. It should be noted that there is no artificial lighting in the lane which makes this application of even greater concern.

It is of note that the planning application WA/81/10 Mill Ball for a therapy business was refused partially on grounds of the impact that the additional cars would have on the lane. Also of more relevance is that the LDO8 land at Binsted (Binsted Nursery) was removed from the Local Development Order for Horticulture in the Report July 2016 due to WSCC's concern over the unsuitability of the lane for HGV's – that 2 HGV's are unable to pass each other due to the narrowness of the lane.

For the reasons stated above, I object to this planning application due to the commercial contractor business being proposed by the applicant. Binsted Lane and Hedgers Hill are just not suitable for this type of enterprise and it's vehicles.

Kind regards

Julia Plumstead
Copperfield Cottage
Binsted Lane
Arundel

