

From: Jane Anstee [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 March 2014 14:08
To: Planning
Subject: Revised application A/82/12

Dear Sir/Madam

I object to revised planning application A/82/12 for the following reasons:

Firstly, I do not believe that any evidence exists to demonstrate any need for this development, particularly as existing new-build and other existing housing in the area remains unsold.

In addition, I understand that Arun's policy is to build on brownfield sites before greenfield sites and to avoid building outside the existing built-up area. The proposed development does not comply with this policy. If there really is a need for new houses to be built in Angmering, then small areas of new houses scattered throughout the village would meet this need and would be less detrimental to the character of the village. The proposed development is for 139 houses, but I cannot think of any reason why a development of any size, however small, on the land to the east of Roundstone Lane would be beneficial to the village or should be approved. I strongly fear that if this development is allowed to proceed, it will set a precedent for other developers and within in very short space of time the whole area surrounding the existing village of Angmering will become completely built up.

The proposed development would be unsustainable. The existing infrastructure and services are already under pressure and are not adequate to meet the needs of the additional residents who would buy the new houses. There are already severe problems with water supply shortage and flooding, both of which would only be exacerbated by the concreting over of green areas, which would reduce the available surface area for rain to soak away. Existing drainage and sewerage pipes are inadequate to meet the needs of the properties that are already here, with pipes already collapsing in the Dell.

The car park at Angmering station does not have enough spaces for existing commuters and travellers, so that people already have no choice but to park in nearby Downsway, reducing that stretch of road to a single carriageway with associated safety issues all day, every day. There are no jobs within the village for the people who would buy the houses, so they would need to travel to work and the number of commuters using the station would increase. Having previously lived in other parts of the country, I can state from personal experience that the bus service in this area is the worst I have seen, so those new commuters who did not travel by train would have no alternative but to travel to work by car, adding to congestion in and around the village at all times of the day, and especially causing problems in the narrow village lanes, at the already dangerous pinch-points in the village and along the single-carriageway stretch of the A259, which is already a bottleneck. At present, the by-pass is not used because drivers prefer to take a short-cut through the village, usually in excess of the speed limit and causing danger for pedestrians in the village. All of these traffic problems would be made much worse by the increased numbers of cars on the roads in and around the village, that would be an inevitable result of this proposed development.

In addition, I understand that the planning application includes an exit road from the proposed new development onto Roundstone Lane. Given that most households nowadays have two cars, one can reasonably estimate that this development would result in an additional 278 cars turning out onto Roundstone Lane every day. The point at which Roundstone Lane curves round into Nursery Road is already a dangerous junction, firstly because of parked cars at the bend in the road, which reduces visibility for moving traffic. For some reason, the double yellow lines do not extend around this bend in the road. Secondly, many drivers do not observe the correct priorities at the junction of Roundstone Lane and Nursery Road, since most drivers who intend to continue along Roundstone Lane in either direction simply do not stop at the "Give Way" lines if travelling south, or, if travelling north, do not give way to traffic coming from Nursery Road. The situation for pedestrians waiting to cross the road in the area of this junction is perilous and it will be no surprise if increased traffic results in a serious, and most likely, fatal accident.

A further and very important objection to the proposed development, which would increase traffic in and around the village, is that it is in contravention of the government's plans to reduce emissions.

The new school that was promised when the Bramley Green development was built has never materialised, and existing schools are already overcrowded. If existing schools have to accommodate even more children, the quality of education they can offer to all children will be adversely affected. Some parents moving into the new development

may seek school places in neighbouring towns and villages, putting those schools under more pressure and, more importantly for Angmering, increasing the amount of traffic already on the roads in and around the village, not only at peak times, but throughout the day. Since the schools are situated to the north of the village and the proposed site of the development is to the south, there would be more parents driving their children to schools in Angmering, as well as more cars on the roads because of parents having to take their children to other schools outside the village. Congestion is already a major problem in Arundel Road, making the area dangerous for parents and children who choose to walk to school, and this would be made worse by the additional traffic. There is currently no safe route to school and it is impossible to see how one could be developed if the new housing development is approved.

Finally, the existing medical services, i.e. the medical centre in the village, the local hospital and hospices, are already struggling to meet the needs of the people already living in the area. It is not unusual to have to wait two or more weeks to see a GP and this area already has a high proportion of elderly residents. If the proposed development proceeds, with increased numbers of people needing to access medical services, there could be very serious implications for the health and wellbeing of all village residents, particularly those who are most vulnerable.

I strongly feel that the proposed housing development would compromise the right of existing residents to a reasonable quality of life and as such, would not comply with government policy on sustainability and quality of family life. I believe that my concerns are shared by the majority of people already living in Angmering and that the abovementioned factors are valid reasons why the proposed development should not be approved.

Yours faithfully
Mrs J A Anstee