

27 MAY 2014

RECEIVED

1 Northwood Cottages
Burndell Road
Yapton
West Sussex
BN18 0HR
18 May 2014

Ref; planning application F/9/14/PL

Dear Sir

With reference to the above planning application we would like to lodge an objection to the proposal for the building of 45 dwellings on the land to the south of Burndell Road. In this we have a personal interest as our property abuts the field in question on 2 sides and our views over open fields will be lost and this will no doubt have a detrimental effect on the value. We were told on the purchase of our property that there was a covenant on the adjacent field to prevent any development.

The visibility to the south when leaving our driveway is limited due to the bend in the road and any exit from the proposed new development would be even more limited and would present a hazard as vehicles do not stick to the 30mph limit and are regularly moving a lot faster. Consideration should also be given to the queues which extend past the junctions with the A259 at the southern end of Burndell/Yapton Road adjacent the Oyster catcher public house and to the "comet corner" junction with the A259 to the south of the village.

Having lived in the village for over 30 years we have witnessed the steady growth in size of this once rural community with the building of new houses on numerous swathes of agricultural land. More recently work has started on land behind Goodhew Close and Fordwater Gardens and signs have now gone up for more houses behind Fellows Gardens and there have been meetings held in the village hall for more development to the north of the church and now this proposal along with a bridge to future possible development to the east.

With all of the recent and ongoing development we fail to understand the need for even more housing, where are the occupants of all these properties going to work? Certainly not in the village which will just add to the congestion as the new residents travel further to get to their place of work.

It should be noted that this part of the road floods during heavy rains and has had particularly bad flooding on at least 2 occasions this year, further development can only make matters worse as less land will be available for run off and drainage once covered with concrete and tarmac.

Following the replacement of the street lamps the level of light pollution has grown and we can read books in our front bedroom without the need for interior lighting during the hours of darkness, further lighting at the rear of our property would make it even worse.

The proposed construction will have terminal effect on the regular wildlife visitors to this field which include deer, foxes, badgers and numerous bird species all with young that thrive in this sheltered habitat.

To my knowledge there has been no increase in the size or capacity of the village school which remains as it was when our children attended classes nearly 25 years ago so a continued building policy within the village would only make the school more overcrowded than it already is.

There has not been an obvious increase in available employment in the village or within the surrounding area so where are all the occupants going to work, further out it would seem and therefore more traffic, more emissions more environmental impact. Why not build extra houses where there is a need for extra workforce.

What fails to make sense is that a company can see a parcel of land and despite it being outside of the development plan can still apply to bend the guidelines to their own requirements.

- All development must take full account of the need to protect the environment (and yet they want to build on it)
- The general attractiveness and diversity of the landscape (and yet they propose to build on it)
- Protect the open and undeveloped nature of the countryside (and yet they seek to develop houses on it)
- Protect areas of wildlife and ecological value (and yet drive wildlife from the fields)

Whilst we understand the need to increase the housing stock across the country we feel this needs to be tempered with safeguarding the existing communities, it seems wrong that all this development is happening in Yapton, Barnham and Felpham locally whilst at the same time Walberton, Slindon, Binstead and other surrounding villages seem to be escaping.

On a final note we recently have had a planning application for an alteration to the roof on the rear of our property refused and one of the reasons given for refusal was that it would impede the neighbour's view of the field, what then will these 45 units do?

Regards

Wendy Jones & family