

1 July 2020

FOR THE ATTENTION OF MICHAEL EASTHAM

I would like to object to Planning Application A/76/20/PL for the development of 84 dwellings on land west of Dappers Lane and make the following points for your consideration.

When a Planning Application for development is approved, it would seem that each one is considered in isolation and almost always results in the necessity to remove trees and hedgerows. Taken individually, the removal of a few trees and hedges here and there is perhaps of no great consequence. However, if the total number of developments already built, currently under construction or approved for the future was considered as a whole, it can be seen just how much of our rural community and environment is being eroded.

- Dappers Lane housing in 2017 totalled 26 dwellings only with direct vehicular access to the lane. Since that time and if the current Application is approved, 6 new developments will be in process or awaiting build and will increase the number of properties with direct vehicular and pedestrian access onto Dappers Lane to 233 - a massive increase in one short rural lane.

In addition, the following developments within easy reach of Dappers Lane have been approved, some of which are already built or are under construction:-

Land East of Roundstone Lane -	709 (plus 62 care home beds)
Land East of Dappers Lane -	488 (of total 525)
Land South of Water Lane -	175
Land West of Arundel Road -	160

These additional 1532 new houses, plus the 62 care home beds which will also generate a number of staff, visitors and traffic, will result in a massive and foreseeable further increase in both vehicular usage of Dappers Lane to access the A24 and A27, and in footfall and cyclists wishing to visit the South Downs National Park (and this was certainly what happened some years ago as a result of the Bramley Green development and is, increasingly, happening again as new residents move into properties East of Roundstone Lane).

The above new housing developments already have - and will increasingly - result in a large amount of destruction of currently available hedgerow.

The site plans show that a significant area of trees and hedgerows bordering the site along Dappers Lane, which currently provides a refuge for wildlife, will be cleared and destroyed in order to construct the access roadway and footpaths.

What has taken many decades to fully mature cannot immediately be replaced by developers planting a few trees and shrubs, however welcome that mitigation may be. Until the new trees, etc. reach the same level of maturity as those destroyed, the myriad of wildlife, birds and insects dependent on various forms of hedgerow for breeding, feeding, shelter, security (life itself!), will have to relocate to what is fast becoming less and less available and/or suitable habitat. It could be many many years before future local residents will be able to explore and appreciate the wildlife that we have all been able to take advantage of and enjoy within the immediate locality.

- Whilst the South Downs National Park Authority is obviously very aware of the potential loss of trees and hedgerows, I suspect their prime concern, not unexpectedly, is what is or is not directly in sight of that area.

Although what is described above does not impede views from the Park, surely, that should not in itself make the destruction any more acceptable to the Arun Planning Committee?

- It is a naïve and unrealistic belief that motorists adhere to the 'no entry' instruction at the northern end of Dappers Lane as the signage is frequently disregarded - even more so outside the current lockdown restrictions.
- In addition, although it is quite legal for cyclists to enter Dappers Lane travelling southbound under the A27, there are many (at times 3 or 4 one after another) who travel at greatly excessive speeds down the hill whilst navigating around at least two bends with the real potential of meeting (particularly) on those bends oncoming vehicles travelling north either already in or heading towards a derestricted speed zone.

I would suggest that this is a foreseeable serious (at best) or fatal (at worst) accident waiting to happen now, even without the greatly increased amount of traffic from all the current developments.

- A claim is made in the Application that an additional 84 dwellings (this could mean around 200 residents and 110 vehicles plus numerous visitors), will have little or no adverse impact on noise pollution. That may be true if they were to be situated within a totally urban environment but certainly not the case in an area which is currently essentially rural and where the vast majority of any noise is created only by nature, i.e. birds, etc.
- It is no exaggeration to point out that in prolonged or very heavy rainfall, water completely covers the whole width of the northern part of Dappers Lane, travels downhill past our property and, in effect, creates a fast flowing river. In a particularly cold and icy winter any residue of water freezes and then turns the lane into an ice-rink.
- The Government and various medical bodies are keen to promote the health and environmental benefits of “active transport”, i.e. walking, cycling, horse riding, etc. The development proposed in this Application is counter-productive to that aspiration as it will have the effect of contributing to Dappers Lane becoming too hazardous to allow the safe pursuit of such methods of travel.
- Dappers Lane is about the last rural route (if not the only one) in Angmering with direct access to the South Downs National Park without having to cross the A27.

Do we have the right to make that route so unsafe that it can no longer be enjoyed?

- The proposed site and our garden - which borders the site - is habitat currently frequented by much wildlife, some protected by varying degrees, in particular, hedgehogs, grass snakes, bats, owls, grey herons and a number of other unusual birds. We have also been lucky enough to have wild ducks and moorhens that regularly fly into our garden and have raised their young around our pond at various times. All this will be lost.
- One final concern, there is an old well in part of our garden adjacent to the site. Prior to any possible (but hopefully not) approval of this Application and potential subsequent damage to the structure of the well (or our garden, if it subsides!), I would hope and anticipate confirmation that this is not of any archaeological interest and will not create a problem on our property if it is disturbed.

CONCLUSIONS

It is, I am sure, generally accepted that the increasing housing requirements throughout the country do need to be addressed. However, during the recent past, the additional developments built, under construction, approved or under consideration within the comparatively small area of the northern and eastern part of Angmering, provide a total of 1,739 additional dwellings covered by 16 Planning Applications (not including the 62 bed care home). Using published UK average figures of 1.3 vehicles and 2.4 residents per household, this will result in 2,260 additional vehicles and an additional 4,173 residents. These figures will, of course, be even higher if the impact of the 62-bed care home is included.

Can this number be effectively serviced by our existing local GP surgeries, other medical facilities, schools, roads, etc?

The current number of Planning Applications being approved in this area could be considered as an irresponsible and unnecessary amount of decimation of one of the few remaining rural areas within Angmering and an unmanageable and unfair burden on our local infrastructure, with little benefit to the existing residents of Angmering. The greatest benefit of this development (and possibly a number of others) would seem to be the ability for the developers to be able to market the properties as being on the edge of the South Downs National Park. Whether or not they could claim a link and infer that the development would also be in a quiet and attractive rural area, is debatable.

Bearing in mind that funds promised by previous Developers have done little to improve the infrastructure so needed within Angmering, is it now time to steal a march on what seems an eminently sensible Government Manifesto pledge and for us to start implementing – even if the Government does not - (and I quote):- ***“Infrastructure first - We will amend planning rules so that the infrastructure – roads, schools, GP surgeries – comes before people move into new homes”***.

Not only is the Government advocating increased housebuilding to meet the housing needs, it also calls for more green spaces. In relation to this current Planning Application, whilst the green spaces planned are very welcome (especially the one adjoining our property!), a couple of play areas on a development site of c.3.7 hectares is not a big ratio to the whole.

Perhaps if this development must go ahead, it should be reduced to a far fewer number of properties and the space thereby made available used to create, say, a larger meadow area. Admittedly, less profit for the developers but of greater benefit in helping to ensure both the future survival of wildlife, in particular birds, bees and other insects, and in the longer term the enjoyment and health benefits for the current and future population.

AILSA ADAMS (Mrs)