



Mike and Sandra BURTON
37 Oak Tree Lane
Woodgate
Chichester
PO20 3GU

13th July 2021

ARUN District Council
Planning Department
Civic House
1 Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Dear Sir,

I write to object to the planning application AL/81/21/PL-Ryefields Farmhouse, Woodgate.

I wish to take this opportunity to raise questions regarding the Transport Technical Note accompanying the planning application as this appears to be incorrect on several points which I believe effect the current application as submitted.

1. Page 2 Item 1.8 states "Access to the site is gained from Oak Tree Lane.
This is repeated on Page 5 Item 1.31

This statement I believe is incorrect.

Oak Tree Lane can be viewed in two parts, the western half of the lane running from the A29 to approximately 7m short of the western boundary of the proposed development site, is a Private Road maintained by the current residents of Oak Tree Lane. The road in this section is surfaced with pavement areas. The eastern half of Oak Tree Lane is a rough and narrow unpaved track, this runs from the paved road surface, 7m to the west of the proposed development site, to the Woodgate Centre. This section of road is also a private road, owned by the Church Commissioners.

It is recognised that Mr Cox, the owner of Ryefields Farmhouse, has a Right of Way along both sections of Oak Tree Lane and that this easement would also apply to his 'Successors'. However the purchasers of Mr Cox's garden, the Developers, and indeed any potential owners of dwellings which are erected on this site would not be regarded as 'Successors' but as 'Additions'. As 'Additions' they would not 'inherit' the Right of Way along Oak Tree Lane from Mr Cox and therefore the development site can be viewed as 'landlocked'.

To state therefore, that access to the site is by way of Oak Tree Lane is therefore, I believe, incorrect and therefore misleading. Exclusion from the Right of Way would affect many of the statements made by the

Developer including access to transport, highways issues and the access to main services, water, drainage, gas and electricity.

2. Page 3 Item 1.14 states "...a 2m wide footway along the western frontage of the site..."
Page 5 Item 1.31 states "....2m wide footpath along the western section..."

From the submitted plans at page 3, page 6 and the roof site plan the proposed 'pavement' is shown on the northern side of the proposed development site. I do not understand how the Developer can state the footway is on the Western Frontage of the site? It is not easy to understand how such a simple mistake of West and North could occur? The previous application was refused, one of the points of refusal being the lack of a continuous suitable footpath and the lack of accessibility to all users, especially the needs of vulnerable users'. This specific point was highlighted by both the ARUN Planning Officer and the Planning Inspector (Appeal Decision APP/C3810/W/193243619 and AL/72/19/PL.

3. Page 5 Item 1.31 with regards to the 2m wide footway the item states "that will tie in with the existing footway provisions of Oak Tree Lane".

H M Land Registry WSX65210 shows the boundaries of the adjacent property of the Woodgate Centre. This plan shows, quite clearly that the property of the Woodgate Centre extends to the west of the proposed development site lying between it and the last easterly property of the current Oak Tree Lane estate. This 'finger' of land effectively lies between the proposed development site and the current estate of Oak Tree Lane. The two sites, the proposed development and the existing Oak Tree Lane estate are therefore effectively separated by 7m. I fail to understand how the Developer therefore intend to join the footpath on the proposed development site to the existing footpath of the Oak Tree Lane estate? Does he intend to construct a footpath on land he does not own?

It is therefore incorrect for the Developer to state the path they will create on the proposed site and the existing pathways of Oak Tree Lane will 'tie-up'.

The importance of an integrated footway should not be underestimated. The proposed development site, if built, will extend the current inhabited area eastwards and therefore potentially form a pedestrian link into the planned 'linear park' which will form an essential area of the major development of SD5 Barnham/Eastergate/Westergate (BEW).

I therefore submit that the proposed development would not be accessible to all users, other than by vehicle, and would not meet the needs of vulnerable users. This is a very significant matter which seriously conflicts with both the development plan and Framework policies.

4. The design of the houses for the potential development site, is at odds with the current street scene. The previous application (AL/72/19/PL) went almost overboard in their literature, if not the actual house designs, to impress that their development would be an extension of the existing Oak Tree Lane estate. This application would appear to take the stance that the current street 'scene' is irrelevant. The proposed dwellings would appear to be different in shape and certainly in the choice of external materials i.e. tile hung exterior walls.

5. The house types are also 'out of step' with current demand. 3 and 4 bedroom houses are not currently needed it is 1 and 2 bedroom houses that are needed locally.
6. Under current average family sizes (2 adults, 2.3 children/home) five new dwellings would equate to almost 12 extra children of school age. This is equal to between a third and half a class. All the local schools, at all levels, are currently over-subscribed. This would therefore result in extra vehicle journeys to schools further away.
7. With the exception of the problem raised above regarding the lack of a continuous footpath to the proposed development area which I believe is of major importance and clearly significant enough to refuse this application I believe the other matters raised, whilst accumulative in themselves, would not amount to sufficient grounds for refusal of this application. However I do believe that this development is premature in terms of the detailed delivery of the Barnham/Eastergate/Westergate strategic Plan.

The proposed development of 5 houses would not have a significant effect in addressing the shortfall of the District housing land supply. Policy H SP1 of the Local Plan sets out the overall provision of at least 20,000 new homes through the local plan phased over the plan period to 2031. At present the strategic housing site policy for (SD5), (BEW), is in excess of 2300 units to which the 5 proposed dwellings would however be a contribution.

Policy H SP2 of the Local Plan requires development proposals within the Strategic Site Allocations to be comprehensively planned. This application is being made prior to the submission and approval of the detailed masterplan for the BEW strategic allocation. The applicant does not appear to have collaborated with the 'Southern Consortium' and other landowners to ensure that the site is planned in an holistic manner and, perhaps more importantly to both the existing and future members of the community, that necessary infrastructure is both planned and delivered to accommodate the amount of development envisaged for the area (BEW). This development, as with others however small, should play its part in this comprehensive development.

All development, especially in the light of the existence of the 'Local Plan' (local democracy in action) is only acceptable if it creates and contributes towards the necessary infrastructure and facilities and thereby mitigate the impacts of the development itself. To allow even small development to act outside the given commitments of others involved, i.e. the Southern Consortium, is both wrong and unfair to everyone. To allow this application would be to 'open the floodgates' for 'early applications. This would allow certain developers to flout their collective responsibilities to both developers remaining within the Southern Consortium and to the community. It would make a mockery of the 'democratic decisions' which have occurred of the last few years to create and implement the Local Plan for house building in BEW.

The collation of ideas and thoughts to create the Local Plan has taken literally hundreds of hours and been years in its creation. It is for many residents the manifestation of local democracy. To allow certain developers to 'shirk' all responsibilities to the community, to ride rough shod over local decision making by allowing them to press ahead regardless of the overall planning policies for the area would be both irresponsible and could easily destroy the current levels of cooperation which are enjoyed between the majority of developers, planners and local authorities (District and Parish Councils).

The problems facing this Developer would therefore seem considerable all because they wish to commence construction in advance of others. Should they choose to wait access from the south of this site would put the developer in direct contact with Woodgate Road which is planned as a direct east-west road connecting both the existing A29 and the proposed relief road. It would also provide the development site with direct access to all service facilities and in addition allow the site to be reconfigured with a greater number of dwelling.

8. As a consequence whilst the principle of residential development on the application site, as with others in these days leading up to the full implementation of the Local Plan, may be acceptable this development needs to be planned as an integral part of the BEW strategic allocation. In its present format, attempting to exit onto Oak Tree Lane, the site is ill conceived and wasteful in that it could cater for more houses if planning was integrated with other developers so that the proposed development exited to the south towards the southernmost connecting road, between the A29 and the proposed Relief Road, of the BEW plan. It is considered that the proposed development is premature in terms of the detailed master planning and delivery of the BEW strategic allocation. Whilst a scheme could be delivered on this site independently from the wider allocation it could undermine the delivery of a comprehensively planned settlement contrary to Policy H 2P2.

Yours faithfully



M & S Burton