



Mr N Crowther  
Group Head of Planning  
Arun District Council  
Civic Centre  
Maltravers Road  
Littlehampton BN17 5LF

Our Ref  
Your Ref  
Date

16 April 2018

Dear Mr Crowther,

**PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE OF FARM SHOP TO BAR/CAFE, AT CROSSBUSH FARM SHOP,  
LYMINSTER ROAD, LYMINSTER – APPLICATION LY/28/17/PL**

I made representations in response to this application, on behalf of my client Mrs R Andrew of Brookfield, Lyminster Road, in my letter of 23 January 2018. I note that since then the application has been substantially revised, significantly to alter the nature and scale of the development involved. As a result, the objections and policy conflicts I identified in my initial representations now apply with even greater force to the revised proposal.

The revisions to the proposal which was the subject of the application initially submitted appear to involve a significant increase in the extent of the site and a very substantial increase in the scale of provision to be made for customer parking.

The alteration to the application site boundary encompasses a much larger site area than initially proposed. The extent of this increase is not limited to a minor adjustment to the red line defining the site, but is such as to be tantamount to a wholly different application. It appears to me that the proposal as now put forward can not legitimately be regarded as an amendment to a current application, but should be treated as a wholly new proposal, subject anew to the applicable statutory procedures.

Irrespective of the legal and procedural considerations arising from the alteration to the application site as defined, the change proposed to the parking provision to be made further emphasises the policy conflicts I drew attention to in my previous letter of representation. The site is outside any settlement boundary, within a rural area. It is not readily accessible other than by reliance on the private car. The increase in the level of car parking proposed (from around 18 to some 60 spaces) emphasises, and is clearly a reflection of, the relative inaccessibility of the site by sustainable transport modes. In this regard, there would be even greater conflict with the provisions of the development plan than I previously drew attention to. There would also be fundamental conflict with the provisions of the NPPF, which seeks to ensure that developments attracting significant numbers of people should be accessibly located within defined centres.

The location of the proposed pub/café (a use within Class A3 of the Use Classes Order) in a location with very limited accessibility other than by car, would be in clear conflict with national and local policy. The substantial increase in traffic movements arising from the over 3-fold increase in parking provision will clearly give rise to a much greater impact in terms of noise and disturbance, severely and adversely affecting the amenity of nearby residential properties.

I note that the highway authority has also drawn attention to sub-standard visibility at the access to Lyminster Road. This, coupled with the substantial increase in intensity of its use, would give rise to unacceptable harm in traffic safety terms.

For all these reasons, in addition to the points I set out in my letter of 23 January, planning permission should not be granted for the pub/café proposal in this sensitive, rural and relatively inaccessible site.



**Rob Huntley**