

Nicholas Bishop
4 Linfield Close
Angmering
Littlehampton
BN16 4GP

Arun District Council

25 March 2014

Dear Sirs,

F.A.O: Planning Department
Re: Barratts Planning Application – A/82/12

I object to Barratts Planning Application, A/81/12.

There are many reasons to object to this proposal, which include the development being against Arun District Council's ("Arun DC") own policy to build on Brownfield sites before Greenfield sites and there are certainly plenty of unused Brownfield sites available. Other examples are:

- There is no need for this many extra houses in Angmering, especially as Barratts are but one of three or four greedy building companies after profits rather than actually fulfilling the needs of the community. Should one lot be approved the others will follow and instead of 139 houses (which is a huge reduction from 150), there will be 600 or so properties to cover the entire Greenfield areas that provide a buffer between Angmering and the A280. I appreciate that the A280 is the Angmering "by-pass" and therefore appears as prime land to the money grabbing building companies, however as well as providing a Green buffer, the land provides a considerable refuge for nature. Many animals and birds live on this Green land and there is no need for this to be disturbed.
- Concreting over this amount of green fields will undoubtedly cause problems with drainage as rain will be unable to soak away naturally and will therefore increase the pressure on an already overloaded and inadequate drainage and sewer system, which can lead to localised flooding. An example is the considerable amount of the flooding over the winter period, albeit from excessive rainfall with a contribution from excessive building. In addition, it is rain soaking away naturally that provides our drinking water and by further reducing the Greenfield land, Arun DC will be increasing the potential for droughts. Especially as there would be 139 to 600 new houses all requiring more water than is currently used in the area.
- There is only a limited bus service in Angmering, which encourages people to have and use cars. In fact, most families seem to have two or even three cars per house. An extra 139 to 600 houses would therefore generate between an extra 278 to 1,800 cars. Angmering's small roads are already extremely busy so to add even 278 cars would be not only a serious environmental issue, but would create additional congestion, delays and probably a danger to pedestrians. In addition, the A259 single carriage stretch between the A280 and the station is already a bottleneck with delays and the new and much larger Haskins garden centre appears to have made this worse. Further cars and extra congestion is expected when the new Asda opens, so creating even more would be ridiculous. More importantly, there are too many cars around the schools, some of which is definitely due to lazy parents, and this is certainly a danger that would only be seriously increased. However, turning the A259 into a dual-carriage way would only increase the speed of most vehicles and create added danger for pedestrians.
- Schools are another issue, as the primary schools are full and the main Angmering Science and Sports College is over subscribed. I believe that Barratt advised that a new school is not required for less than 1,000 houses, so 139 to 600 houses would therefore not generate the need for a new school.

However, where are the children supposed to go to school when the local ones are all full? They would have to travel to other towns or villages thereby creating more traffic congestion. Another point here is that the same excuse was used for not building a new school when Bramley Green was built as it was only a 600 house development. However, surely when you add the 600 houses from Bramley Green with the 139 to 600 houses on the proposed developments, you get between 739 to 1,200 houses and a school would therefore seem appropriate. Barratt's or the other developers obviously have no intention of building a new school and equipping it as this would severely decrease their huge profits. In addition, even if a new primary school was built, there is no capacity for the children to move to the Angmering Sports & Science College.

- The Barratt proposal is for predominantly larger more expensive housing, which will not be affordable to local people on local wages, so the houses would be bought by people from other areas, who would then still commute to their current place of work. This will create even more congestion on the roads, or if people commute by train the station car park is normally full so people park in local roads, which causes congestion and hazards.

Notwithstanding the practical issues above, we, as a family, bought our house because it was not smack in the middle of a housing estate and looked over green fields with trees and wildlife. Should this or other money grabbing unnecessary housing developments be allowed to go forward, when many other suitable Brownfield sites are available, our quality of life would be seriously impacted. In addition to the completed development, the noise and dust and general disturbance of the building work would be a serious detriment to the enjoyment of our lives, and the development would most likely decrease the value of our property.

I thank you for your time with this objection letter and hope you will see fit to decline this and any similar proposals for this, or other, local Greenfield sites.

Yours faithfully,

Nick Bishop

Cc. Angmering Parish Council
Nick Herbert MP
Save Angmering Village