

Members strongly objected to the application on the following grounds:

That there is insufficient detail regarding up- to- date information relating to **matters to mitigate climate change** (ECC SP1 a,b,c and f and ECC SP2 a, b and c) including (but not exclusively) photovoltaic cells for heating or ground source heating facilities and/or solar provision of hot water (D DM1 8), electric charging points for cars (T SP1iv and QE DM 3 and Arun District Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document), Members further considered that all glazing should be of a high standard, triple A construction and insulation of walls and roof also. This should be specified by the authorising authority before building can go ahead. (D DM1 4) Members considered that there were missed opportunities for new construction techniques to be explored and that properties should be built as close to Zero Carbon as possible and that this would include high standards of insulation and technologies such as solar panels to reduce emissions. Members further considered that there is scant reference of the strategy to reduce **noise pollution** from the Osborne site and that this should be clarified before development begins. Members noted that there is no assurance or strategy for the promotion of quality improvements in construction skills **(SP1c)**

In relation to **Flooding Issues**, Members felt that provision should have been made as to possible future flooding issues especially in light of the expectation that we can see more flash flooding as a result of the Climate Crisis. Policy W SP1 Members strongly believe that the site is unsuitable for development, as this winter much of it under water for a considerable amount of time. DM2 Flood risk.

In relation to provision of housing for **older residents**, Members noted that there is no provision of single storey housing to facilitate the provision of accommodation for older residents, for those wishing to plan for future requirements or for those with disabilities, **(D DM1 5 and D DM 2)** which Members considered to be a major omission.

In relation to **transport**, Members noted that the site should also have provision for shared 'club' cars. Members considered that there should also be parking enforcement to ensure that cars cannot park on pavements and that pedestrians feel safe and are given priority. Members believe that there should be access to Rose Green Road for cyclists in order to encourage this mode of transport (Policy T DM1) and that there should also be proper storage and locations for visiting cyclist to secure their bicycles. Members consider that it is difficult to see how the vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian access to Sefter Road is going to be safe and more consideration should be given to this. Members noted that The Arun Local Plan 15e Transport states that there should be an effective and deliverable Transport Assessment. Members felt that this had not been adhered to and that Highways England has not appreciated that 280 new houses at the Sefter Road Development will impact on the safety, reliability and/or operations of the Strategic Road

Network. Members consider that it is likely that residents of this development will commute to Chichester and further afield causing further congestion especially when the traffic generated joins the A27 and that will increase traffic on this congested network. Members were unconvinced that there will be sufficient parking for parents dropping off or picking up children from the school. This school will attract more children than just those from this development. Members would need to see a plan which does not leave traffic in a similar situation to that chaos at the Chichester Free School or a strategy to control parking in the vicinity of the school and prevent properties within the development from being disadvantaged.

Members further consider that bus routes and bus stops need to be clearly identified and a condition should be that shelters are provided for passengers. There are no areas set aside for self-build or-custom build. The area “set free” should the school not be required could provide an allocation for this type of development (H SP2p and QE DM3 a)

In relation to **bio-diversity**, Members consider that the type, provenance, numbers and age of trees should be provided and that areas, separate to designated play areas, should be set aside to encourage and enhance bio-diversity, incorporating elements of bio-diversity e.g. bat and bird boxes (H SP2c and ENV SP1 and ENV DM5)

In relation to **play areas**, Members considered that further information is required regarding the type of play equipment provided in play areas, the provision of specialised play equipment for children with special needs and the need to ensure that older children have outdoor facilities separate from those for younger children. Furthermore, there appears to be no provision in a housing development of 280 dwellings for youths who would not want to use facilities for younger children. Some of this requirement might be mitigated by reviewing the existing play areas at the junction of rose Green Road and Hook Lane, and also at The Nurseries.

In relation to **communications**, Members noted that there is no information on internet provision. This development should be taking the lead in the provision of developments in broadband speed and a condition should be that high-speed provision is available to all properties. (TEL SP1)

Furthermore, Members considered that there is little if no reference to the provision of **public art**. Examples exist in other developments and should be studied and replicated in some form (**D DM1 12**)

Therefore Members agreed that the application is in direct conflict with the Arun Local Plan 2011-33 and Supplementary Documents.