

From: Charles Caney [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 May 2022 11:42
To: David Easton [REDACTED]
Subject: Application No M/16/22/PL

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 Sir,

I am writing in SUPPORT of this application for a golf course to the south of the A259/Grevatts Lane. I live on Ancton Lane. I believe this is a creative use of land that I understand is no longer required for agriculture. Golf is a sport that can be enjoyed by most of the population (young and old, male and female) and as such helps make the population healthier. Furthermore the facilities that will potentially go with the golf course may also be of great community benefit.

Also, what would become of this farmland if this application was refused? No doubt, sooner or later, it would be turned into yet more housing. As the letter from the Elmer Sands Committee recognises, this planned gold course is far preferable to yet more housing. I believe this plan, if permitted, would demonstrate a (positive) turn away from the current unimaginative use of land, whereby the only development in the wider area that appears to be made is into residential housing. The area for which Arun District Council is responsible deserves to have a more diverse land usage pattern than simply sprawling residential estates and I think this golf course is evidence of a start of that process. As such it is to be welcomed.

Many objections are raised but:

- Some are irrelevant (as they relate to a different planning application at the current golf club site i.e. FP/274/21/OUT);
- Some are duplicated and submitted multiple times;
- Some provide no details of the reason for the objection;
- Some raise environmental objection which the planners submitting the application have already sought to address (admittedly in quite long winded technical documents which are hard to follow at times, as Churchill once said "this report, by its length, defends itself against the risk of being read". I think that is the problem here...those who have objected on environmental grounds haven't read the relevant technical docs (or they have done so but, quite understandably, can't follow them).

There are only certain objections that the planning authorities can take into account when considering such applications. For example, a statement such as "the golf course should stay where it is" etc...are not objections that can be taken into account.

Whilst being SUPPORTIVE of the objections, I do agree with the comments made by many of the objectors that the traffic situation on the A259 on at Comet Corner (in particular) is dangerous and needs to be resolved quickly. I do not think this application though will make the situation at Comet Corner materially worse (I also note that if the

land was instead turned into another housing estate, that would make the traffic situation far worse than this proposed golf club would do).

I also hope that to permit this golf course to be built on former agricultural land will not be later used as a precedent for the building of houses on nearby/adjacent land. I do not agree that a golf course is the same as a housing estate and view the golf course (although it is a "managed environment") as much closer in nature to agricultural land than a housing estate is.

I hope my comments will be considered, and I apologise for submitting them later than the requested 9 April 2022 date.

Kind regards

Charles Caney