

Mr J D Henderson  
2 Styles Field  
Dappers Lane  
ANGMERING  
Littlehampton  
West Sussex  
BN16 4EN

Arun District Council Planning Dept.  
1 Maltravers Road  
Littlehampton  
West Sussex  
BN17 5LF

30 October 2018

Dear Sirs

**Planning Application Ref No; A/114/18/PL - Broadlees, Dappers Lane, Angmering.**

With reference to the above application for the building of a Nursing Care Home in Dappers Lane Angmering to which I have already registered my objection, I wish now to respond to the letter from Ms Anna Gillings dated 19<sup>th</sup> October which is after the closing date for comments but no doubt will be considered by ADC.

The letter is in respect of representations made and objections raised against the application, I find its tone is rather dismissive and it attempts to belittle the serious concerns of the Objectors.

I fully accept that the Care Home is replacing 24 Care Apartments, that it will have a very similar footprint, I also acknowledge the access is identical to the approved application A/27/16/P however I maintain the Developers should proceed with this as the Dappers Lane site is not suitable for 29 Care Apartments and a 70 bed Care Home.

**Parking/Traffic**

The reason why the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan states the site will provide a suitable number of parking spaces is because the application states only 23 staff are required to run a 70 bed Care Home, it also claims it will be operated on a two 12 hour shift pattern, it is these numbers and how the Home will be managed that mean the TATP must be questioned.

In her letter Ms Anna Gillings mentions the residents of the Home will be in the **last three years of their life with considerable care needs**, and that the care will be of **‘high quality’**, I’m not aware of any qualification or experience in Care Home Management for Ms Anna Gillings, her Application does not address the requirements of Regulation 18 of the Quality Care Commission Regulations and does not provide support for it’s claims. You have data from the National Statistics Office on labour and shift patterns that contradicts those in the Application.

It is the dangerous assumptions that only 23 staff will be required that enable the TATP to claim sufficient parking is being provided.

Qualified medical staff will be legally required; they will need to **‘hand over’** patients at each shift end, doubling parking requirements.

There will need to be sufficient Registered Nurses to cover 14 twelve-hour shifts per week, it is unlikely for a Nurse or any employee to work more than 48 hours per week and there will need to be additional staff to cover for sickness and holidays. Where will these qualified people come from.

To care for, clean and help feed 70 elderly patients many as indicated suffering from Dementia, Alzheimer’s or receiving Palliative Care is 23 staff sufficient, is it not highly likely more staff will be found to be needed and require parking on site, too late to be catered for in this design.

That is without considering the parking needs of staff required to provide the meals, the clean laundry, admin and wages services and maintain patient’s personal and medical records?

WSCC has not objected on these matters because the numbers stated are being compared against their own guidance calculations, which are currently under review as they are recognised to be 18 years out of date.

There are not enough parking spaces on site and the only alternative is the surrounding residential streets, Ms Anna Gillings makes no mention in her letter of the concerns raised about this or of the lack of public transport.

### **Scale and Form**

I am not able to respond to this section except to say that the concerns are real to the objectors. We all must rely on the ADC staff to examine in detail the plans to ensure they are in fact of **‘domestic’** scale, that the revised building is not too high and the protruding gables do not just enable the scale to be **‘justified’** and that overall taken with the 29 Care Apartments the site is not an **‘over-development’** of the space and is in keeping with its surroundings.

### **Privacy**

As above besides taking notice of the objector’s sincere concerns ADC must ensure all regulations are adhered to. Mention is made throughout the letter that the new building is **‘similar’** to building 4 of an approved application; this is a **‘new’** application and must be treated as such, if it fails Privacy it should require revision or be rejected.

### **Noise and Pollution**

The rejection of these objections is rather selective, Broadlees was a single dwelling, it is being replaced by either 53 two bedroom Care Apartments or 29 Care Apartments and a 70 bed Care Home, there will be a considerable increase in noise and pollution.

Besides transport issues another cause of noise and pollution not responded to is the laundry and kitchen which will be working 24/7, shift changes, deliveries, noise, smells and lights are all types of pollution will be present, if the Application if approved it should have restrictions written in to it.

## **Drainage/Flooding**

Again I'm not qualified to comment, ADC and the responsible authorities have to be relied on to ensure the well-held and serious concerns about flooding are addressed.

## **Tree Issues**

I can only state that this site is located between two country lanes, the development will be intrusive and out of place, either the original or this new application, ADC and the responsible authorities must ensure protected trees are looked after and that additional planting is carried out to screen and reduce the impact of the development.

## **Previous Applications**

Like Ms Anna Gillings states **'it is important'** to understand all the reasons why the 2014 application was rejected. Just because the site is now within the designated built up boundary following the adoption of the Local Plan it is not correct for her to say ADC should dismiss the previous ruling.

**In 2014 it was decided that the site was not large enough for 27 Care Apartments and a 60 bed Care Home, the numbers are now 29 and 70.**

Besides the letters of objection to the application it was considered the development required more public infrastructure than could be supplied, the site would rely on and result in increased car borne travel, the development did not meet the objectives of ADC on affordable housing and the site was and still is in the Countryside.

These reasons for rejection are still relevant, if not more so given the increase in size.

## **Additional Comments**

There is no mention in Ms Anna Gilling's letter responding to the concerns raised regarding the capacity of local medical services available to meet the needs of the residents and patients. Current facilities are below what is already required, the developers have decided not to provide any facilities as part of their design relying instead on Angmering and The Coppice Surgeries, which are already at maximum capacity.

This situation has been recognised by the NHS CCG but their solution of a contribution by the developers of **'£70,348.00'** will not pay for a single additional Doctor for a single year.

I repeat my objection to this Application and request the ADC refuse it, allowing the original 53 Care Apartment application to proceed.

Kind regards.

Yours sincerely

