

Amanda Scholes

From: Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 11 September 2012 15:57
To: Amanda Scholes
Subject: FW: Objection RE: Barratts Planning Application Ref A/82/12 **with Attachment**
Attachments: Objection Letter to ADC re Barratts A8212.docx

Mandy Looks like they realised they hadn't added attachment and sent it again. Please see this one

~~Nicola Spencer~~ | ~~Technical Support Manager, Planning Department, Arun District Council~~ | ~~Location: First Floor, Arun~~
~~Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF~~

Internal: 37446 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37446 | E-mail: nicola.spencer@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

Behalf Of Planning

Sent: 06 September 2012 12:49
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection RE: Barratts Planning Application Ref A/82/12 **with Attachment**

Rep.

From: Verona Brennan [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 September 2012 09:36
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Objection RE: Barratts Planning Application Ref A/82/12 **with Attachment**

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
CC: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection RE: Barratts Planning Application Ref A/82/12
Date: Thu, 6 Sep 2012 08:33:57 +0000

Verona Burgon
1 The Chantrelles
Angmering
West Sussex
BN16 4GR

06-09-12

RE: Barratts Planning Application Ref A/82/12

I object to Barratt's Planning Application Ref A/82/12 for the following reasons:

- 1: I know there to be **several brown field sites** in Angmering that are suitable for housing development without the need to destroy the green field sites off Roundstone Lane. Arun District Council have stated that their objective was to make use of brown field sites. Failure to do so seriously questions the credibility of ADC.
- 2: Since these brownfield sites do exist I object to developments that threaten to **infringe on the view from the National Park** by housing on the proposed site. Despite promises by Barratts, or indeed any obligation on Barratts to minimise the negative impact, it is totally unnecessary when suitable alternatives exist.
- 3: Angmering village's **roads are not suitable** for any further development of this kind. High Street cannot be widened to accommodate more traffic. The houses were build many years ago and so, many are sitting on the roadside without a footpath making it impossible to expand the road to accommodate more traffic or to provide footpaths without compromising the road. It is simply unsuitable. Weavers Ring has the same problem. It is a very narrow cut-through that is reasonably tricky to negotiate with no footpaths for the safety for pedestrians and leaves very little room for motorist error. Angmering's streets cannot absorb the extra traffic a new development will bring. **The A259 needs to be a dual carriageway. New supermarkets** and new housing has, and will continue, to increase the strain on this road. It is unacceptable that any development should ever be considered without providing the necessary infrastructure investment needed. In my experience there has been a significant increase in volume of traffic and therefore the delays travelling on this road. (I have photographic evidence of this)
- 4: I have heard that there are plans to use the proposed social/affordable housing to re-house residents of London Boroughs. If this is true I completely object to taking on someone else's problem. Social housing in Angmering should be to provide homes for *Angmerings* needs – no more. Where housing development is deemed genuinely necessary, (and on brownfield sites) any social/affordable houses should be sympathetically placed to respect the rights and feelings of those residents who are shouldering hefty mortgages - this is only fair. Furthermore, **any developments, affordable or otherwise, should be solely to meet the needs of Angmering residents.** Also a speech given by David Cameron on Sept 5th 2012 states that developers obligations on affordable housing is to be relaxed.
- 5: I am stunned that the idea of building an **'employment site on Water Lane** to provide jobs for the residents of the proposed housing development' has ever been entertained! It simply cannot work. Realistically, one builds houses to provide for the employed - not the other way around. You cannot artificially create a successful dynamic in this way and it is lunacy to think otherwise!

- 6: I am aware that there are many houses in the Arun District that remain unsold. New development is an unjustifiable destruction of the precious and diminishing countryside. It is also a waste of money.
- 7: Unjustifiable development will have a hugely negative impact on the existing residents of Angmering. It is very easy to work in an office and, perhaps without meaning to, forget the impact your decisions have on other human beings. We all have a right to a modest but comfortable quality of life. Cramming all these houses into a tiny unsuitable village like Angmering will compromise this **quality of life**. I believe that points 6 and 7 are in direct contradiction to the Governments Policy regarding sustainability and family life. **As Nick Herbert said when he visited the village last that it seems with Bramley Green "Angmering has done its share."**
- 8: With regard to **schools**, I have heard many times from officials that the schools can accommodate an increase in students. This is not true. As a mother living in Angmering, I know for a fact that siblings have in very recent times been separated into different schools due to **over subscription**. Angmering School cannot sustain the proposed population growth when it is already providing not just for Angmering, East Preston, Rustington and Littlehampton pupils but it is the main school for residents of villages like Findon and others further afield. The junior schools are also under strain. From a safety point of view, school children are at present, at considerable risk due to the lack of suitable routes to school. Angmering's **footpaths, indeed lack of them, are a disgrace**. I have walked the school route up to the Arundel Road and was shocked by **the lack of safe routes**. While the problem does need to be addressed in the short term, it will only be exacerbated by the extra traffic and pedestrians further housing development will bring.
- 9: The **train-line** itself provides a good service. However, the carpark is always full and commuters are parking in surrounding roads which obviously creates problems for those residents not to mention the safety issues there in. There is no more capacity to accommodate more commuters.
- 10: The Southeast of England is becoming **drier and drier and more drought prone** as the years pass and yet more intensive housing development is being sanctioned. Horsham, Billingshurst, Storrington, Broadbridge Heath, to name but a few. For the sake of the limited water resource and the ever increasing **threat of hosepipe bans** (so very early in the year) **due to water shortage** I object to this development.

Finally, as a resident of Angmering I urge you to please carefully consider all our objections. Please try to see them as you would if you were in our situation. Please recognise the validity of all our concerns and objections - this is far more than a "not in my backyard" objection. Please acknowledge the human cost, the cost to our quality of life. I am sure that by doing so you will make the right decision.