[redacted]

From: Neil Crowther
Sent: 30 July 2019 20:54
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: P/30/19/OUT Hook Lane and AW/134/19/HH Balliol Close

From: Cllr. Tony Dixon [redacted]

Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2019 6:37 pm
To: Councillors - Development Control Committee
Subject: Fwd: P/30/19/OUT Hook Lane and AW/134/19/HH Balliol Close

Dear members of Development Control

I am on holiday at the moment and unable to come along and speak at the 7th August meeting.

Please consider this e-mail in lieu of a personal appearance!

P/30/19/OUT Hook Lane

Controversial or large-scale planning applications should not be heard during the holiday period when many members of the public (and councillors!) are away and unable to participate. We are here to serve the best interests of the public and if we are sincere in wanting to improve engagement with the public then this planning application should have been deferred in order to maximise public participation.

I object to this planning application for the following reasons:

An almost identical application is currently at appeal stage - P/6/17OUT and the council's position is robust. This application is premature, and seeks to avoid the outcome of that appeal. The council should await the findings of the appeal before determining this application.

I have been observing large groups of Brent Geese on this site, during the winter period, for the last 3 or 4 years. Any evidence to the contrary by officers or Nature England must be rigorously scrutinised.

This application makes changes to access that are not substantive enough to make a meaningful difference.

The key objections for planning applications P/6/17OUT and P/113/99/ (both of which were refused) still apply:

Loss of best and most versatile growing land – following Brexit, food self sufficiency and therefore food security will become even more important for the UK.

The road infrastructure is already overburdened and cannot cope with additional housing. Pollution will increase from queuing traffic.

We live on a coastal plain, the land is flat, and the water table is very high. Drainage of surface and ground water to the sea is slow, even more so at times of major weather events, via a small network of rifes and Pagham Harbour, all routes to the sea are tide locked twice a day. We also have the South Downs to the north shedding water southwards towards the coastal plain and sea. The field regularly floods in winter and is unsuitable for development.

Southern Water regularly discharges raw sewage into Pagham Harbour. It is quite clear that the sewerage system cannot cope now and that large scale development will make matters worse. As a statutory consultee Southern Water has a major credibility issue and their evidence is undermined by their well evidenced failure to discharge their duties correctly. How can we trust their evidence?

AW/134/19/HH Balliol Close

West Meads is a low level, open plan estate, with many bungalows. At the moment, as far as I can tell, there are a number of existing loft conversions in bungalows on the estate, all of which are served by Velux style windows, which means that there is no discernible difference to the exterior design of those bungalows.

In this case, the architect has done a good job in minimising the impact of the proposal on the wider estate. The loft conversion faces out of the estate and will only be seen by one or two neighbours.

However, although well disguised, if this application is approved it would set a design precedent that is out of keeping with the wider estate and which could be used as a precedent for similar proposals in less discrete locations.

I therefore object to this planning application on the grounds that it will set an undesirable precedent.

Thank you for considering these points.

Councillor Tony Dixon
Ward member for Aldwick East