Mrs Jennifer Chapman
11 Water Lane
Angmering
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN16 4EJ

The Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre

12th September 2012

Re: Barratts' planning Application Reference Number A/82/12

Dear Sirs,

I object to Barratts' Planning Application A/82/12 because there are properties that have been built on the last 10 years, just minutes away from the village (Rustington/Littlehampton border) that remain unoccupied and unsold. This lack of need for new properties makes the proposed development unnecessary and frustrating.

My objection to Barratts' Planning Application A/82/12 is also because Arun's policies include building on brownfield sites before green field sites and a scattering of small scale developments on brownfield sites would be more appropriate in the village. Plus, I am not alone in concern that if this development is allowed to go ahead then it could be the thin end of the wedge. Further plans to purchase and build at sites such as Worthing Rugby Club and Manor Nurseries could gain momentum, thus Angmering village would lose another business and a key social and recreational facility for both children and adults in the shape of Worthing Rugby Club.

In addition, I object to Barratts' Planning Application A/82/12 because although Paragraph 4.5 in the Draft Local Plan states that there are 'possible new Primary School places' this is little more than a vague statement. Village schools have already had to expand to capacity to cope with the result of 600 new houses being built at Bramley Green. A new school was proposed then but was never built. Arundel Road, where the two Primary schools are located, is already dangerously congested at school times and the proposed area for development would mean even more cars since it is too far for children to walk to the schools.

Furthermore, I object to Barratts' Planning Application A/82/12 because medical facilities are already stretched, with appointment waiting times at the doctors' surgery being a week long on many occasions.

I object to Barratts' Planning Application A/82/12 because it will mean the sale of an employment site when proposals have been made for an employment site in Water Lane. If employment sites are required then why sell the VHB site for housing. VHB have long been

employers of local people and is a more suitable business site due to its proximity to the main road network, bus routes and Angmering station. In contrast an employment site in the Water Lane area would increase the congestion in Angmering Village. Traffic from an employment site at Water Lane would travel through the village as exiting Water Lane would only take them north, and the site is also a significant distance from the nearest station. Additionally, Water Lane is an area at risk of flood and an area that *has* been flooded on several occasions, most recently June 2012. The proposed business site would increase the risk of flooding because it would mean concreting over a green field area that provides vital drainage.

Finally, I object to Barratts' Planning Application A/82/12 because concreting over green fields will reduce the surface area for rain to soak away increasing the risk of flooding, when, as stated in the Draft local plan (4.35), 'Care must be taken to ensure that development is not inappropriately located in terms of flood risk, and does not exacerbate flood problems.' My home was among several properties that flooded with rain and sewage water in June this year and 13 weeks later the property has only just been certified dry so the builders can begin the reinstatement. My neighbours and I now face significantly increased insurance premiums and considerable difficulty in selling our properties for a reasonable price, should we wish to do so. In addition we have the constant worry that our homes could flood again.

Angmering may have coped with the building of Bramley Green but I believe for the above reasons that the village could not sustain any further large scale developments. The businesses and Rugby Club in Roundstone Lane all add to personality of our village and to see them replaced by yet more housing would, in my opinion, create a negative change. I moved to Angmering because it is still at the moment a true village and because of its semi-rural position. If developments continue then Angmering will simply merge into the sprawl of housing and supermarkets between Worthing and Littlehampton.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Jennifer Chapman

[redacted]

Subject: FW: Objection to Barratts' Revised Planning Application Reference Number A/82/12

Dear Sirs,

I object to Barratts' revised planning application A/82/12 (139 dwellings) for exactly the same reasons outlined in my previous letter of objection to 150 dwellings, please see attached. The concerns outlined by myself and others have not been addressed so reducing the number of dwellings by 11 does provide a suitable solution to our concerns.

In addition to my objections outlined in my attached letter, I would like to add: I object to planning application A/82/12 due to the impact it will have on the already congested A259 single carriageway. In order to serve so much development initialising from Roundstone Lane this stretch of road would need to be widened to two lanes. Faced with delays on the A259 more and more traffic will be likely to cut through the roads of Angmering village, such as Water Lane and The High Street, in order to avoid the congestion or to access the new development and Bramley Green. These village roads are not equipped to deal with an increase in traffic and such an increase would be dangerous.

Surely the reduction of dwellings from 150 to 139 is little more than a gesture (note the choice of 139 not 140 dwellings; the same ploy as offering a product at £199 rather than £200?!). In addition, by submitting a revised plan Barratts are taking the opportunity to hope that those objecting have become weary and will not mobilise to object to this revised plan, thus indicating acceptance by default. However, if none of the original objections have been addressed then the assumption should be that the original objections still stand.

Kind regards,
Jennifer Chapman

[redacted]

Please find attached my letter of objection to the above planning application.

Kind regards,
Jennifer Chapman