

Julie Grieves

From: Sue Bowley on behalf of Planning
Sent: 28 September 2012 11:22
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Planning Application A/82/12 (Barratts) - Objection
Attachments: Planning Application A_82_12_Objection Letter_HA_27Sep12.pdf

Sue Bowley | PA to Assistant Director, Planning & Economic Regeneration, Head of Legal & Administration & Head of Neighbourhoods,
Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37533 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737533 | E-mail: Sue.Bowley@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2012 15:54
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application A/82/12 (Barratts) - Objection

Please find attached objection letter.

4 Apple Grove
Angmering
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN16 4NY

M
Email: ha

27 September 2012

The Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

**Re: Planning Application A/82/12 - Objection
Barratts' 150 houses east of Roundstone Lane**

Dear Sir

I write to express my strongest objection to the above named Planning Application A/82/12 for the following reasons:-

Having been born and lived in Rustington, West Sussex, attending both primary and secondary schools in Angmering, with relatives living in Rustington, Angmering and Worthing during my childhood, I have chosen to live and raise my own child in Angmering Village.

With spending nearly 15 years residing in Buckinghamshire, Berkshire and London Borough of Bromley, Kent, for work, I made the conscious decision to move back to West Sussex as I wished to raise my little one in a safe, tranquil and peaceful setting that Angmering Village offers.

Schooling – currently with two primary schools in the village and Angmering School providing secondary education, spaces will become more limited resulting in local children having to travel further afield incurring additional travel requirements.

I understand the requirement for a 3rd primary school to build within the Bramley Green development did not materialise as initially promised to local residents.

Traffic Systems/Roads – additional housing within Angmering Village on large scale will increase already strained roads into and out of the village. The burden

placed on A259 at rush-hour times can increase journey times significantly already.

Infrastructure – with an increase of housing the scale for the proposed application, demands will be greatly increased on the already over-loaded and aging drainage and sewer pipes, together with extremely stretched fresh water supply with the need for hosepipe bans to be considered and implemented early this year in 2012.

Medical services – the current medical practice within the village is a purpose-built clinical services provider, which is pushed to serve the current village population I have found when looking to make appointments for my young son. The medical practice has a duty to ensure government targets on healthcare provision are met and this will be further stretched with a large influx of residents to the village.

Loss of Greenfield Site – the land sited for the above named planning application is countryside/greenfield area bordering Highdown Hill and the South Downs which would be lost if built on.

Is consideration to build/rejuvenate brownfield sites not a priority in these current times of loss of greenfield sites and protecting natural landscape for generations to come?

The above reasons are my deep concerns should the above named planning application be granted meaning that the village aspects of Angmering and Sussex Life will be lost completely.

I trust fair consideration and due diligence to each proposal/objection is undertaken in the planning application process.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

cc Angmering Parish Council
cc Nick Herbert MP
cc SAV (Save Angmering Village)

22
Julie Grieves

From: Sue Bowley on behalf of Planning
Sent: 28 September 2012 11:22
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection letter - Planning Application A/82/12
Attachments: Planning Application A_82_12_Objection Letter_27Sep12.pdf

Sue Bowley | PA to Assistant Director, Planning & Economic Regeneration, Head of Legal & Administration & Head of Neighbourhoods,
Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37533 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737533 | E-mail: Sue.Bowley@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2012 15:57
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection letter - Planning Application A/82/12

46 Church Road
Rustington
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN16 3NN

27 September 2012

The Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

**Re: Planning Application A/82/12 - Objection
Barratts' 150 houses east of Roundstone Lane**

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the Planning Application A/82/12 for the following reasons:-

Medical care/GP practice - with my sister as a local resident in Angmering who has Parkinsons disease, the need for good access to local healthcare is essential.

Roads and traffic flow through the village and surrounding areas – a further large housing development will increase the traffic flow through the village and put strain on surrounding roads outside of the village.

Loss of countryside/green land – local council policy to build on brownfield sites before building on greenfield sites should be fully considered.

Current housing supplies in nearby areas – large housing developments build on previous nursery land east of the BodyShop headquarters, off Toddington Lane, A259 still has properties unoccupied and unsold several years after building completion.

Yours faithfully



cc Angmering Parish Council
cc Nick Herbert MP
cc SAV (Save Angmering Village)

Julie Grieves

From: Sue Bowley on behalf of Planning
Sent: 28 September 2012 11:22
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection letter - Planning Application A/82/12 - corrected address
Attachments: Planning Application A_82_12_Objection Letter_amendedaddress_27.pdf

Sue Bowley | PA to Assistant Director, Planning & Economic Regeneration, Head of Legal & Administration & Head of Neighbourhoods,
Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37533 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737533 | E-mail: Sue.Bowley@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2012 16:03
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection letter - Planning Application A/82/12 - corrected address

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
To: pla [REDACTED]
CC: ni [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection letter - Planning Application A/82/12

6 Church Road
Rustington
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN16 3NN

27 September 2012

The Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

**Re: Planning Application A/82/12 - Objection
Barratts' 150 houses east of Roundstone Lane**

Dear Sir

I wish to object to the Planning Application A/82/12 for the following reasons:-


Medical care/GP practice - with my sister as a local resident in Angmering who has Parkinsons disease, the need for good access to local healthcare is essential.

Roads and traffic flow through the village and surrounding areas – a further large housing development will increase the traffic flow through the village and put strain on surrounding roads outside of the village.

Loss of countryside/green land – local council policy to build on brownfield sites before building on greenfield sites should be fully considered.

Current housing supplies in nearby areas – large housing developments build on previous nursery land east of the BodyShop headquarters, off Toddington Lane, A259 still has properties unoccupied and unsold several years after building completion.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the sender.

cc Angmering Parish Council
cc Nick Herbert MP
cc SAV (Save Angmering Village)

Julie Grieves

From: Sue Bowley on behalf of Planning
Sent: 28 September 2012 11:23
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Objection to Barratt's Planning Application A/82/12
Attachments: Objection to Barratts A 82 12.doc

Sue Bowley | PA to Assistant Director, Planning & Economic Regeneration, Head of Legal & Administration & Head of Neighbourhoods,
Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37533 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737533 | E-mail: Sue.Bowley@arun.gov.uk

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



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 September 2012 16:18
To: Planning
Cc: Angmering Parish Council; [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to Barratt's Planning Application A/82/12

Please find attached my objection to Planning Application A/82/12

Regards
Susan Ware

3 Cumberland Road
Angmering BN16 4BG

27 September 2012

The Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Dear Sir

I strongly object to Barratts' Planning Application **A/82/12** for the following reasons:

Houses should not be built Greenfield agricultural land outside the built-up area

This goes against the Policies in Arun's Local Plan and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Brownfield land should be built on before Greenfield.

150 houses at one site is not wanted by villagers, there are better sites in the village

The Neighbourhood Plan survey and the poll of all parishioners conducted by Save Angmering Village (SAV) clearly indicates that the people of Angmering do not want large-scale housing developments and only want up to 100 houses (built between now and 2028) in small groups of up to 10 units scattered on Brownfield sites throughout the built up area.

The Localism Bill states that villagers can choose where they want houses built, and they do not want houses at the proposed site.

Furthermore, this proposed development is only the tip of the iceberg. Barratts have first refusal on the land adjacent to the proposed site and, if this application succeeds, it will only be a matter of years before the remaining houses of their initial proposal (ie another 150 houses) are built. It is documented that Persimmons want the Rugby Club land for housing (possibly 200 houses) and that the VHB West End Nurseries are showing their plans for housing on the site in October 2012 (possibly another 200 houses). This "domino effect could see 800 – 1,000 new houses on the Greenfield land east of Roundstone Lane. The draft Local Plan that the VHB land and the Rugby Club land should remain as is and is not for housing, but this could easily be changed or overridden and all the houses could be built. 1,000 houses in addition to Angmering's existing 3,500 houses would increase the "village" by a third again. Angmering already grew by 27% when Bramley Green (600+ houses) was built. If the new houses were built Angmering's growth rate would far exceed anywhere else in the District and the south east of England.

No demonstrated need for all these large houses. We need a few 1-2 bed properties

There is no demonstrated need for all these houses in Angmering. The Neighbourhood Plan is surveying the parish to find out the need for housing in the village. There is every indication that this will find that Angmering needs reasonably priced 1 and 2 bed flats/houses for its elderly residents and for young people to get on the housing ladder. "Affordable" is a very loose term which means different things to different people. We need housing that is priced such that the mortgages can be paid with low-medium wages from local jobs. We do not need 4 and 5 bed expensive houses which are only affordable to people from outside the area with high paid jobs to which they need to out-commute. Angmering only needs a maximum of about 20 "council houses" for people on the waiting list. To build 150 houses in order to achieve this is a crazy "sledgehammer to crack a nut" approach.

The district already has a glut of "newbuilds" which remain unsold. The developers have halted building on their existing sites because people cannot get mortgages. Angmering does not want a half-finished building site eyesore, with empty houses and all the problems (vandalism etc) that could ensue.

No local jobs means more out-commuting and highway safety issues and reduced Quality of family life

There are no local jobs which pay sufficient wages to pay for the high mortgages for existing residents, let alone an influx of people from 150 new houses. If these houses are sold the people will have to out-commute adding to the traffic chaos and road hazards. Roundstone Lane is a narrow lane, with existing problems. Parked cars and the pinch points make for highway safety issues. The proposed entrance/exit to the proposed site is in totally the wrong place and is an accident waiting to happen. Peak time traffic queues back along Roundstone Lane (and if cars try a different exit route out of Station Road that is equally as bad). Cars do not use the A259 and then the A280 by-pass route. They rat-run (sometimes at speeds exceeding the unenforceable village limit of 20 mph) down the narrow bendy High Street and down the narrow non-pavemented Weavers Hill to get onto Water Lane and out the village onto the by-pass. Extra cars from a new development (say 200 from the 150 houses, or even up to 1500 from 1,000 new houses) would be disastrous.

The bus service (7am-7pm Mon-Sat) is no alternative to commuting by car as it is so infrequent. Commuting by train would mean quite a walk to the station, or yet another car journey. Cars park in Downsway rather than the station car park and this reduces the road to a hazardous single lane for quite some distance along the road. Cars use this as a fast rat-run to avoid the single section of the A259. I understand there has already been one death of a child. How many more deaths will happen with an increase in traffic?

If the VHB West End Nursery land is sold for housing then there will be a further loss of village jobs.

This would mean more out-commuting with all the inherent problems of pollution and traffic congestion and highway safety, which reduces the villagers' quality of family life to which we have a right.

There are insufficient school places now, it would get worse with more children from this proposed development and others that would follow

The villagers were hoodwinked when Bramley Green was built. They were told there would be 200 houses, 20 children and a new school. The money for schooling went to St Margarets for new buildings. The school now has 37 pupils in some classes. This is not good for our children's education. The two primary schools are situated in the north of the village and because of the distance and hazardous route to school (some roads have no pavements) a lot of children are driven to school by car. This adds to air pollution and highway safety as cars park all along the roads surrounding the schools, reducing them to single lane traffic. Arundel Road is sometimes impassable at school times. Some village children have to "out-commute" already to surrounding schools as priority is given to children of the school's faith from other areas. All of these problems will be increased if there are more children from a new development. WSCC have stated that the formula for a new school would mean 3,000 new homes need to be built first. This is ludicrous. The plot of land in Bramley Green first earmarked for a school is still there. The Village needs a new school now, so goodness knows where any children from a new development would go to school.

The site is too close to the South Downs National Park

Even all the landscaping in the world would not hide such a blot on the landscape. The development would be visible from the high ground of the Park. This goes against the Park's objective to preserve the countryside and the views. The government promote Greenfields to act as a natural division between villages and the building of this development contravenes this policy.

Flooding and Drought

Both of these are very real issues in Angmering. We are now on water meters and there was a hosepipe ban this year (again). The water is not seeping into the aquifers in sufficient quantity for the existing residents. How will there be enough for people from a new development, especially if the land is concreted over? Southern Water will say that they can supply the water, but would they guarantee this with compensation if there wasn't enough? Are they honestly sure they can supply this water? Have sufficient investigations taken place?

Then there is the issue of flooding. Angmering has had at least six serious floods in the past 20 years. The rock formation is such that Angmering lies in a flood risk band. Housing should be built where there is less risk from floods. Again, concreting over large swathes of Greenfield, with all its water absorbing qualities is an accident waiting to happen. There is the real risk of sewage mixing with flood water as was seen in the most recent floods.

Reports and surveys have been done and there is more suitable geological land which is safer from the flooding risk. Why not build there?

The present infrastructure and services are inadequate for existing residents, how can they support any more people? The proposed development is unsustainable.

There have not been any upgrades in infrastructure in Angmering for a long time. Angmering has seen many new estates over the years- The Dell, Greenacres Ring area, Bramley Green. All of these have tapped into existing sewers, drains etc. The system is old and is failing. There have been collapsed pipes in The Dell.

There are no NHS dentists in Angmering. The Doctors' surgery is at capacity. People have to wait two weeks to see the doctor of their choice. Hospitals in the area are running very near to breaking point. Ambulances have to come from some distance away and are stretched. Hospices are full. That is the situation now, what will it be like with another 300 or so people from this proposed development?

Prematurity

Angmering is not the only village in the country with the threat of new development being dumped on them. However, they, unlike some, do have a draft Neighbourhood Plan which is quite far along in the making. There is also the Draft Local Plan which has clear indications of preserving the Greenfields outside the built-up area. It does contain the 490 houses for Angmering left over from the SE Plan but this is in the process of being revoked. Other villages have had applications for new housing rejected on prematurity grounds. I think there is a very good case for this application to be rejected for the same reason.

The short-sighted view is to allow development and get the Developer's contributions (Section 106 monies etc) to help buoy up the ever-depleting Council funds. The long term is much different. When all the land is covered in houses that people can't afford and that

the government have to pay for (in the form of DSS payments) where will the Councils get... there month then?

Please see sense and stand up against the stupidity of building yet more unsustainable, unrequired, unnecessary, and unwanted houses. Do not go down in history as being the Council that destroyed all the Greenfields just to meet the targets imposed upon you by Central Government and fill the coffers with Developers' contributions for some of your projects.

Please reject Planning Application A/82/12.

Yours faithfully

Susan Ware