

From: STEPHEN LOCKLESS [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 July 2022 14:04
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection Planning Application FP/274/21/OUT

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.

Dear Sirs

We strongly **Object** to planning application FP/274/21/OUT.

I outlined my objections to this application on 08/03/2022 and still stand by those objections, since the publication of further documents on 04/07/2022, which I have reviewed, I wish to raise further objections.

Access to Site (Downview Road/Golf Links Road)

When the Blake's Mead development (site 6) was put forward to ADC for approval, Downview Road was going to be the primary point of access from Felpham Way (B2259) to the new development. Upon consideration ,ADC rejected this proposal as being unsuitable for several reasons, which still apply today : congestion, road safety, junction capacity etc.

Access was only permitted from the A259 Relief road.

Downview road/Golf Links Road is not suited for access to the site and as the primary layout of the road and its junctions cannot be altered in any way to reduce the concerns raised by many, I cannot see how ADC after setting a precedent for Blake's Mead can now accept that this route is acceptable.

The developer has proposed to ensure a shared cycle/footpath is incorporated into the plans on site, but upon leaving the site and onto adjoining roads, especially DownView road, no provision has been or can be made. As pointed out in their own Tech Note Response, the paths and verges along both sides of Downview road cannot be increased to the required 3mtrs to accommodate a shared cycle/footpath. As most pedestrians will not be using the new developments proposed cycle/footpaths, and will continue to use the existing paths and road, the additional number of people/vehicles leaving the new site would only impact on these paths and roads. Unless a system of dedicated cycle lanes or shared pathways are adopted throughout the local area, then there will only be negative impacts to all concerned, including the "new " residents.

The Tech Note Response (TNR) shows that the CHA are concerned that a number of the road junctions impacted by this development are already or will be very close to full capacity. Most concerning is the Felpham Way(B2259)/Felpham Road/Downview road lighted junction(1.70 in the TNR) for which the CHA says they cannot accept the proposals by the applicant. Traffic already tails back past the recommend guidance of 550mtrs along B2259 and Downview road at certain times of day.

West Sussex County Council Highways have also stated they do not accept the applicants proposal for the Downview Road junction. they also dispute the number of vehicles using this junction with the applicants findings.

A number of so called surveys where conducted by Taylor Bowie Ltd on behalf of the developer. These took place on 9/04/2022 throughout the day and lasted for 1 hour at each location to assess the road safety aspect of the junctions. The Felpham way/Felpham road/Downview road junction was observed between 09.30 and 1030am and it was reported 2 pedestrians and 1 cyclist was observed in that time and traffic flow was moderate at all times. Firstly i would dispute those findings as this is a very busy junction for pedestrians and cyclist and with education facilities

close by , why was it not conducted at a more appropriate time. Secondly how can you effectively monitor the road safety aspect in **one hour** on one day. this does not give a true reflection of the junction activity. The applicants solution, based on a number of "scenarios", is to rephase the traffic lights at this junction. This lighted junction has already been altered by the addition of cycle traffic lights engaging a few seconds before the vehicle traffic lights to ensure cycle safety. Fatalities have occurred at this junction and to rephase the lights purely to satisfy the applicants wishes is dangerous and not considerate to other roads users, therefore increased congestion is inevitable.

These surveys and scenarios clearly show all junctions will be at capacity on current projections by 2031 if this application is granted.

On current projections up to 2031 these junctions will become so congested that action would be required by the Highways Agency to act. This is only 9 years from now and if this application was to proceed it could very well bring that forward. This would cause major disruption and a huge cost to the Council. Do you think the developer would be interested in footing the bill for such changes . I don't think so.

Increased traffic congestion will lead to more restricted access for emergency and service vehicles, not only on the new estate but on the surrounding roads impacted by this development. Response times for emergency calls are already at an all time high and this will only add more time.

Between the 2011 and the 2021 census's private registered cars increased from 28.5mil to 39mil (37% increase). if this current trend continues and there is no sign to indicate otherwise, there will be around 53.4mil cars on the roads. This will only add to our already busy roads and will have a devastating impact on our little corner of the world. This access to the site must be rejected based on their own findings and the concerns of all stakeholders.

RE: Lidsey Green Residential Travel Plan (RTP)

Part of the RTP is to appoint a Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) to encourage residents to use public transport, cycle and walking thus reducing the need for private vehicles. That clearly worked on the blakes mead development !!!!!. There are certainly more cars on the estate than parking spaces, cars parked on roads and encroaching on footpaths. Access and trying to drive on the estate can be difficult at times. NO bus services currently operate on Blakes Mead and no plans are forthcoming.

How does the applicant think this will be any different ?.

The RTP states the nearest bus stop to the site will be the stop in Wroxham way (270mtrs), so clearly no intention for bus services to operate on the site. This is the number 67 which runs once every two hours. After my own monitoring over several days on wroxham way and Downview road, the average number of passengers over this period was 1.25. Clearly this service is not used by residents on blakes mead and cannot see how the applicant thinks residents on the new site will also use this service.

One of the RTP objectives is to reduce or minimise the scope of conflict between cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles and avoid unnecessary street congestion, this development would only increase all these risk elements.

Flood Risk

The hydraulic report flood risk conducted shows the areas in which flooding is most likely. To the south of the site along the Golf Links Road area is clearly show in Red (figs 5 & 6 in the Bognor Modelling Report), highlighting this area is most prone to flooding. although the risk has been indicated as not causing a significant detriment to these properties, the detriment is still increased. Current climate change predictions are not realistically expected to decrease in the foreseeable future only to increase therefore any rise in flood risk must be taken extremely seriously to existing properties.

Existing ditches and waterways are already under stress and any additional burden placed upon them must be considered.

I note from the boundary and waterway plans that the ditch which runs behind the 17th tee and alongside the fairway of the 1st hole has been omitted from all plans with a new ditch running much closer to the existing properties on Golf Links Road (land use parameter plan P-A005 rev B). This new watercourse will only add to the flood risk element of these properties.

Southern Water reported this new development may lead to an increased risk of foul water flooding from the sewer network. Southern Water have publicly stated that the sewer system is vastly outdated and cannot cope with current demands and with all the planned and building works currently underway, will only lead to more occurrences. Any increase in flood risk is an increase too high.

Bio-diversity

The applicant has indicated that a number of trees will need to be felled including one cat A specimen and will replant as part of the plan. These trees have taken years to build up the bio- diversity they support and simply replanted young trees of probably fast growing species is the not the solution. Once these habitats are lost , the fauna that depends on them is lost too.

The plan is for street trees to be planted, but unless these are trees of a certain species will not support the bio-diversity that will be lost. street trees tend to be smaller so as not to allow the roots of these trees to endanger nearby properties.

Trees and green spaces are vital to combat climate change and by simply cutting down existing trees and removing these spaces and replacing with saplings and concrete is not the way forward.

this green space holds a huge variety of wildlife and no matter what plans are put forward the development both during construction ,which will have a major impact and post construction will lose its wildlife and green space status.

In the LRM letter dated 11/04/22, it states that a presence of Bats has been found on the site, although only a small colony, they have the capacity to increase and as a highly protected species must be allowed the space they need.

As they are close to the construction area, these bats will in all most likelihood disappear.

The letter also indicates the presence of Water Voles. Again these are a highly protected species and on the red list of species facing extinction. They are highly susceptible to disturbance and no matter what precautions are put in place, this site will have a devastating effect on the population. it is against the law to handle or disturb the environment in which these and many other species live and must be protected. Water Voles live in quiet and undisturbed habitats and this will be lost if this application is granted.

General

Under the government Levelling up policy, More investment in housing , infrastructure , employment opportunities are required in the north of the country to spread the burden on the south and make the country more prosperous and afford people the chance to live and work in more areas. It also allows Local existing residents to have more say what goes on in their area. ADC must listen to its local residents and their concerns and not just the "few who want to play golf on a mid winters day in the snow"

The south has endured a huge building programme over the years and ADC has had more than its fair share of developments. New developments in the pipeline , 1200 dwellings in ford, 250 dwellings bilsham lane Yapton, 300 dwellings B2233 Yapton, 2500 dwellings land west of bilsham and 3000 + in Barnham/Eastergate, will only have a major impact on the current infrastructure and services. This site will only add to this burden.

The ADC local plan is constantly referred to by the applicant in their documents as a source of information and guidance, but as previously stated by myself and many others , this location is not mentioned or considered anywhere within the ADC Local Plan, in fact it was discounted as unsuitable for building in 2017. I understand plans can change but not just to suit a development which is not required or wanted, Maybe change the plan for some good.

Anti-social behaviour is now a major concern in the local area and even during the Felpham Parish Council Meeting held at the community hall at Blakes Mead 19/03/2022 experienced a level of this behaviour during our meeting, banging on windows, language, shouting etc. Sussex Police have raised no concerns regarding anti social behaviour or an increase in crime regarding this application, but how often do they patrol Blakes Mead to determine the level of unreported crime ?. Without casting aspersions on good people but local crime WILL increase and the level of anxiety will rise in those close by should this go ahead.

Our schools, surgeries, dentists, emergency services are already at full or exceeded capacity. Flansham park Surgery has already raised its objection to this development which shows the level of capacity. New and current residents will only have a poorer service and will lead to more pressure on the NHS.

A new secondary school was identified as being required in the area back in 2016, but to date a suitable site has not been found and as stated by West Sussex County Council Education Services, local schools cannot be expected to absorb the increase in pupils this site will require. The local Secondary school cannot be extended as stated by WSCC education svcs and has therefore OBJECTED to this application.

With such opposition to this application and concerns over traffic, infrastructure , damage to bio-diversity , flooding, water supply, Local Plans, surely ADC cannot approve this application.

Kind Regards
Mr S. Lockless
26, Golf Links Road
Felpham
PO22 8EU