

From: Emma Tristram [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 January 2018 09:48
To: Ross Leal
Subject: WA/84/17/PL

Dear Mr Leal

Objection to the renewed application for Fairmeads Farm, Binsted (WA/84/17/PL).

1. Misleading documents

There are a few anomalies in the documents which make the application hard to understand.

- On the site location plan RA/670/120, the red line is not keyed.
- On the Block Plan, RA/671/500, dotted lines are keyed 'existing structure and paddocks shown dotted'. As dotted lines are used for both, it is not clear which is 'existing structure' and which is 'paddocks'. If the larger dotted line area is assumed to show 'existing structure' this suggests erroneously that the new structure is smaller than what is there already.
-

2. My previous objection

I sent in an objection to the previous planning application on this site. Parts are still applicable:

A. Traffic safety

As I put it last time, *'The single track, winding Binsted Lane already has to cope with three sources of very large vehicles – Church Farm's agricultural activities, the plant propagation unit of Binsted Nursery, and the haulage business run from Marsh Farm. The*

three close-together bends at the cottages just past Church Farm often cause a situation where cars meeting one of these large vehicles suddenly round a bend have to reverse round a bend, with another bend behind them round which anything may be approaching, often at a too-fast speed.'

Eleven agricultural vehicles are listed as being used and stored at the site if the plan goes ahead. Three are 3m wide, one is 2.75m wide, four are 2.5m wide. If moved from the site these would add unacceptable additional hazards to the already dangerous small winding rural lane. The fact that the applicants run an agricultural contracting business elsewhere (as stated in the application) makes it likely that these movements would occur – see also 3 below.

B. The 'setting' of Binsted Park

Binsted Park, very nearby to the north, is within the South Downs National Park (the boundary of which is 200m from the site), and is protected in the South Downs Landscape Character Assessment (see my previous objection), as is its setting. ADC should consider whether the new application, which adds a modern building of 'total gross new internal floorspace' of 293.50 sq.m. (stated in the Application), is appropriate to this situation. As Richard Spencer points out in his objection to the new application, the previous application involved the demolishing of two buildings and the net gain of floor space was thus only 13 sq.m.

3. The current application

The current application is concerning because of its references to the previous, refused plan in the Design and Access Statement. It states the previous application was refused due to 'lack of fully understanding the nature of any form of agricultural contracting work' by objectors, and also states that 'reluctantly' the agricultural contracting business 'will be located outside Arun District'. This suggests a grievance and raises the suspicion that the applicant may try to transform the site, once permission is gained, into the agricultural contracting business that was asked for before.

This interpretation is supported by the fact that the applicant has bought more land adjoining the site and now owns 6.5 acres. The objection from Julia Plumstead points out that the site on its own would not support the number of sheep or number of bales of hay quoted in the plan.

The eleven expensive agricultural vehicles listed as being kept in the new storage shed are likely to be for use in other areas and on a contracting basis rather than just on the site. This would be similar to the agricultural contracting business that was previously refused.

I object to this new application for the reasons given and also support Julia Plumstead's points about the fire risk, pollution hazards and the ecology of the area.

Emma Tristram

Stable Cottage, Binsted, BN18 0LL, [REDACTED]