

Objection for application P/58/19/PL

And to be considered in the application of P/53/19/L

First of all, I strongly object the new proposed houses at the rear of the Inglenook Pub and the separate application for access. I live in the new Creyfern estate, Spinnaker View, and was actually devastated to hear the news that this lovely area would be ruined. Picking this housing estate specifically because it was not in a built-up area as seen in other developments, learning of this news just two months after moving in to our dream home was very difficult to accept.

Wildlife and green spaces

It was not always an uncommon sight to see green spaces. Nowadays it seems that every green space, however small, is trying to get permission to build houses on. This is such a shame, it is not reversible, it is a permanent decision. When reading the planning statement document, I was troubled when reading point 9 on page 4 when talking about the small proposed area. I quote *"As such, the site is entirely surrounded by built development and its undeveloped state is something of an anomaly."* Yes, it is undeveloped but why does this mean that it needs to be built on? We are losing more and more green spaces. This land is special because it is not farmland so allows many animals including rabbits which have just started to return since the Crayfern houses have been built. This is a lovely sight and something which you would imagine the countryside to look like. Seeing a green space like this is rare and therefore should be preserved. It also sets a wrong impression on other individuals who are lucky enough to own green land. It will make them think that building on every free bit of land is acceptable. We need to keep what is left of our beautiful countryside. I just don't see how clearing this land to cram in houses actually helps the community at all? After all they are not going to be affordable houses, so not helpful many local families. Besides a few hundred meters to the south there are plans for 90 dwellings (which by the way have a larger buffer area between the surrounding houses), so it just makes this proposed site irrelevant considering how much anger and frustration it has caused. If you read the Local Plan Subcommittee document from October 2013 referring to Aldwick, page 10 states that *"When any development is undertaken it is essential to preserve existing separation of dwellings and prevent un-neighbourly cramped or visually intrusive closure of gaps or establishment of ill-conceived linkages between buildings."* This shouldn't be any different in Pagham. *"Preserve and where possible enhance existing green space and amenity trees within the area and replant/replace trees lost to damage or disease."* (Page 11) & *"Preserve the character of the area."* (Page 11). While this is a document specific to Aldwick and its surrounding areas, Pagham I believe should take this into considerations as this new development meets none of the points I have quoted above.

Traffic

Looking through the documents it appears that any traffic reports have been made prior to the completion of Spinnaker View and in a time when it was known not to be busy. As a resident I can say that it is a nightmare to get into and out of our estate. The traffic queues are horrendous and no thanks to the cars parking on the side of the road to go into the Inglenook pub. Imagine if another housing estate was to have its access through the same area, the traffic would be worse. It appears that this has been something that has been going on for a long time. Arun Council Special Development Control committee document specifically on 24/10/18 highlights these ongoing traffic problems for other developments in the area. *"A major concern expressed was that the transport infrastructure was inadequate"* page 27 (Item 9, 159). After experiencing the traffic issues, I can completely agree with the concerns expressed in the meetings. It's not just the queues that are an

issue its also the danger aspect for the public by having so many cars driving blindly through traffic, it only takes on person to step out in front of a car to cause an accident. Not to mention that this dangerous road is opposite a pub which then carries its own danger. The addition of a new access point, which comes in the separate application P/53/19/L, just multiplies the danger.

During school term time these roads already are very busy. Pagham Road and Sefter Road to the north turn into a car park way before 9am and the addition of more vehicles is just going to make things worse. Already I believe that the Crayfern estate will negatively contribute to the traffic problem. A new traffic assessment needs to be looked at immediately and especially during school term time when it is actually a joke. The roads cannot sustain the amount of traffic that currently goes through it. The whole of Pagham road leading to Chichester needs to be reworked or a new road added to improve the flow of traffic on these mornings, adding more vehicles to the roads without solving the problems first is not acceptable. I don't think all of these issues just for 9 houses are worth the hassle at the moment. While the applicant is not responsible for the roads and road conditions, they would be contributing to an ever-growing problem which can be mitigated.

Situation needs to be reassessed now the Crayfern houses are built

Prior to making the purchase of a house in the new Crayfern development (Spinnaker View) we made all of the appropriate checks regarding planning applications and proposals, we were happy to go ahead with the purchase of the house as we were sure no one was going to build in the are immediately to the front of our house. We choose this development because of its openness and not stuck in a 'concrete jungle' as seen in other developments around the Arun area. Suddenly after two months of living here we see a sign highlighting the proposals which is just unacceptable and devastating.

After reading the Planning Statement on page 7, a consultation with the Mill Farm residents association had been held on the 19th February 2019. This is something myself as a resident of the Crayfern site (including other residents) were completely unaware of. The outcomes of the meeting were that the orientation of units 5 & 6 would now be rotated to match the direction of units 1 – 4.

"Concerns were raised over access and parking, overlooking and screening, bonfires and sunlight impacts." Meeting with Mill farm resident's association seen on Page 7 of the 'Planning statement' point 21.

"Following this meeting, the applicants substantially amended the layout plans to take on board the comments and concerns of the Mill Farm residents and parish councillors as shown below." Meeting with Mill farm resident's association seen on Page 7 of the 'Planning statement' point 22.

While this partly resolves issues with Mill farm it is clear that the meeting had taken place in a time before the Crayfern houses had been complete and residents moved in. Therefore, these changes to the plans do not take into account the view of the residents from Spinnaker View. The new layout plan is actually far worse from our side and results in more houses overlooking Spinnaker View. These changes were produced based on drawings from Crayfern but in real life now with residents moved in, these plans need to be reworked to suit both sides. The close proximity to the fronts of our houses is a concern too. Having any screening by trees will not be sufficient as it takes years for the trees to grow and not to mention the trees losing all their leaves. The fence in our close is low enough to actually look over so and no amount of screening can be sufficient in preventing overlooking.

It had been said that the houses had been positioned at an angle to prevent such overlooking however I do not count this as valid because it is obvious people will be able to see into our houses including bedrooms from these angles. I propose that before anything else goes forward, the plans should be reassessed to take the Spinnaker View residents views into account. I invite you to come and have a look yourself in our houses to see how unacceptable and irresponsible these plans are. No one has been in our houses to see the impacts. Even in the Spinnaker View houses we can see into Mill Farm which is the other side of the boundary (which really is unacceptable), having the proposed houses squashed between the two sides can only result in it being much easier for new residents to see into Mill Farm houses opposite due to the closer distance, not to mention Spinnaker View. Coming and talking to residents of Spinnaker View and looking through our own houses should be done even before the separate application (P/53/19/L) seen on page 6 point 17 of the Planning Statement for 'access realignment' is taken any further (*which is clearly a clever way to move one step ahead towards securing planning permission for the 9 houses*) After all if the land is not being used then why does the access need to be 'realigned'.

In the modifications made to appease the Mill Farm residents, unit 7 has been modified from a two-story house to a bungalow. This is something I feel very strongly about, if this application was to go ahead, which I sincerely hope it does not, the units 1 – 6 need to be modified into bungalows too. The maximum build size should be a bungalow. For exactly the same reasons given by Mill Farm residents during the meeting. While I feel that the loss of an increasingly rare green space cannot be replaced, then at least the bungalows solve the overlooking and eyesore issue. The proposals cannot simply suit Mill Farm, they have to suit Spinnaker View too.

Reading the document produced by Mark Warwick (Tree Officer / Parks and Greenspace Team) on the 15th July 2019, the plans do need to be redesigned anyway due to this quote from the document *"The proposed layout places undue pressure on and obstruction of, the most significant of trees. I would expect the layout to be revised so as to avoid any construction within or directly abutting the RPA, and visual obstruction of trees (T2, T4-T7)."* If these houses are in place then the view of these trees will be lost and instead replaced with overlooking houses, not exactly a great sight to wake up and look outside the window for each morning considering how great the view is currently.

Furthermore, in the meeting on the 19th February 2019 it was mentioned that a restriction to the burning of material on site is to be implemented due to the risk of fire on the timber Mill Farm properties. *"Concerns raised about the potential for future residents of the application site to have bonfires on their land, in close proximity to the Mill Farm site with many timber properties, could be addressed by condition should the local planning authority wish to impose a condition restricting the burning of material on-site."* Page 8 'Planning statement' point 25. How is this going to be governed? Are you telling me that in the months and years after the houses have been built residents are going to remember or take any notice of this restriction, I really don't think so. Is someone going to be out on patrol specifically police this restriction, I don't think so either.

I do hope these points are sufficient in objecting the planning application.

Thank You
Resident of Spinnaker View