

Application BN/42/21/PL Objection from Mr & Mrs N J Smith, Wayside, Eastergate Lane, Eastergate, Chichester PO20 3SJ

We object to this planning application and believe that it should be considered as two applications. One for a residential building and the second for the commercial unit. We believe combining two distinct developments into one confuses the situation. The residential property and business are not tied and should not be treated as such.

We object to the planning of the residential property on the following 3 grounds.

1. This site is in CIL Zone 3 & is CIL Liable as new dwelling & is a Departure from the Development Plan.
2. The development would result in the introduction of a residential use outside of the built-up area boundary which would result in the future occupants being reliant upon private motor vehicle for day to day needs; contrary to paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies SD SP2 and C SP1 of the Arun Local Plan and Policies H3 and H4 of the Made Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Development Plan
3. The development in the countryside location fails to respect the established grain and pattern of development in the locality. This results in a building of visual prominence which demonstrably harms the undeveloped countryside character of the locality, contrary to policies D SP1 and D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan, Policies ES5, ES6 and H4 of the Barnham and Eastergate Neighbourhood Development Plan and the guidance on good design within the National Planning Policy Framework.

We object to the planning of the commercial buildings on the following grounds/reasons.

Folly foot farm has not been compulsory purchased but will or has already been purchased by a building developer. The price agreed compensates the land owner for their loss and gives them financial independence to purchase another more suitable site should they so wish. The planning office have no legitimate reason to favour granting the approval of a new 5 individual commercial business park. West Sussex Planning application BN/126/20WS provides for 104,000 sqm of commercial development and this would be a far more appropriate site for this business.

The commercial building application is not on a like for like basis. The majority of the units being combined in the total area were originally single story, wooden apple sheds. Only building A which covers 281m² has specific permission for a carpet warehousing. The other two buildings remain permitted for countryside use only as stables. Including the apple sheds to significantly uplift the area to 715m² is not like for like. This is an opportunist application to rehash application EG/19/04 which was rejected.

One reason given by the head of planning was "*The proposal is unacceptable in that the activity and traffic generated would likely to harm the residential amenities of adjoining dwellings and therefore conflicts with policies C8 of the West Sussex Structure Plan, LOC2 of the West Sussex Structure Plan Deposit Draft and Gen7 of the Arun District Local plan for development in the countryside*". This statement is still true.

Only one micro company occupies the present site as defined by company's house and as such the proposed building of a new 5 independent commercial park does not represent like for like. The proposed change in commercial use for the 5 commercial units represents such a broad change in use as to make it impossible to evaluate the commercial and public traffic that will be created or the affect this will have upon Eastergate Lane. It should also be noted that the proposed A29 realignment transport report estimates an increase in traffic along Eastergate Lane of around 30 percent and that this has not been included in the GTA transport statement. The Whaleback transport section states that "Eastergate Lane is a dual lane road which provides safe access between the A29 and the village of Walberton". It fails to mention that Eastergate lane has a diverse community, with some vulnerable adults. The lane has no footpath and even a slight increase in traffic puts pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders (NMUs) who regularly use the lane in danger. Any HGV which need to turn off or onto Eastergate Lane has to take up both lanes to make the turn and while doing so create a danger to other users.

The proposed new commercial building is around 22ft high and 1,640ft long and will visually be completely out of place. The building is positioned so close to my property as to significantly change the clear unobscured landscape which we presently enjoy. The blight on the landscape does not stop with us and our neighbours, but will include all those who will travel along the proposed new A29 realignment road and those who purchase the proposed new houses opposite. The application mentions a waste disposal unit but fails to provide any more information. We have obvious concerns regarding any pollution or contaminates this unit poses to us and our neighbours.

We would also like to point out that the Whaleback planning document states that Folly Foot farm lies within the Aldingbourne Parish. It does not. It lies within Barnham and Eastergate parish and as such a large portion of the document provides inaccurate information/references.

In Summary we believe the planning application should have been divided in two distinct applications. If they had done so we would not have objected to the residential application but as it is, we are forced to do so. Proposing a five-unit commercial park to replace a micro company which has a vastly different permitted use and area is not like for like. The increase in HGV and public traffic onto Eastergate Lane is incalculable as the use of these unnecessary units has yet to be clearly defined. The potential risk to the local community who use Eastergate lane cannot be underestimated.

Mr & Mrs N J Smith

24/06/2021