

From: Tim Dobbin [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 April 2022 21:53
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to FP/274/21/OUT - Bognor Golf Club

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Re: FP/274/21/OUT

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to register my **objection**.

There are many reasons why this proposal should be dismissed out of hand, not least the council's own commitment to 'rule out' housing on the Golf Club site through the local plan. There are environmental concerns and drainage concerns. The local schools do not have capacity, their recent extensions being already filled with students from the Blakes Mead development. Nor can they be extended further - we would need a new one built. The local surgery is oversubscribed, and the 'village' is turning into one giant housing estate. Anyone buying a home on the proposed development will be sold the dream of a new home close to local amenities, only to find that everything they need - schools, doctors, shops etc will have to be reached by car, and this brings me to the main point of my objection: Traffic.

I have no way to know how or when the traffic surveys were done. I shall only say is that the data does not seem to reflect the reality that I see out of my window every weekday. I cannot believe that true peak time traffic movements have been considered and I see nothing on how to manage the high number of HGVs travelling through the village during the many years of construction.

How can an entrance on to Downview road make any sense? When the Blakes Mead development was proposed it was mandated that no traffic from the new development would be allowed to flow South into the existing network. Every access to that estate is therefore on to the relief road. Vast sums of money were then spent on traffic calming for the village to improve safety and encourage the use of the relief road. It worked, mostly. Downview road and tributaries were given a 20mph limit and traffic calming pillows (this limit and the pillows are largely ignored of course). Why was this limit imposed and money spent on calming? On assumes because of the schools that are accessed by these roads and the large amount of traffic accessing them each day. These are schools that were both enlarged to take the additional Blakes Mead cohort, many of whom travel to school by car. Those that do not, because they are children, are often to be found crossing the road without looking, cycling dangerously, pushing and shoving etc. You can't stop children doing these things, but you can reduce the danger to them by limiting the number of vehicles using that road. An additional 500 houses and circa 1000 cars will NOT limit the danger.

Simple logic dictates that adding around 500 new houses, to be accessed by a road that currently serves around 600 existing properties (far less by the time it reaches the proposed site entrance), will double the traffic on it at any given time?

The residents of the Roundle private estate felt it necessary to block the 'rat run' at their own expense, due in large part to the increased traffic from new homes in the area, and most of those cars are now using Downview road. It is large quantity, at peak times I believe much larger than any number I have seen in the RPS group report submitted with the application.

I also question the reservation of land so that access can be provided to the 'as yet unbuilt' link between the A259 and Arun Leisure Centre. In what way is it a good idea to deliberately connect the A259 to Felpham village through a winding housing estate? This is the very thing that was not allowed to happen with the Blakes Mead development. If the link road is forthcoming, then it should provide the sole access point to the development and the development should not proceed until that link road is built. Better yet the access should go directly to the A259 as is logical, or not build the houses at all.

I do accept that a growing population needs housing, and that the South of England is where people want to live. But if the local plan says that houses are not needed in this location, then either houses should not be allowed on the Golf Club land, or the plan is worthless?

I am also not against the creation of a new golf course provided it is done well and provides benefit to the local area, but surely there must be another way to fund the new course?

As a closing question: For what exactly is the existing club house to be re-purposed and where is the parking for it? I could not see this stated anywhere in the application. It strikes me that should the development proceed, the local community would be better served by NOT having this unwanted, old and high maintenance building remain for the council to support. Maybe a better idea for a 'contribution' would be a purpose built facility that is actually useful, funded in perpetuity by the large profits the club shall doubtless make from all this?

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of T.S. Dobbin.

T.S. Dobbin