

[REDACTED]

From: Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2019 09:25
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Inglenook Development

From: Cllr. Hugh Coster [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 November 2019 15:13
To: Neil Crowther <Neil.Crowther@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: Inglenook Development

Dear Neil,

I don't know whether this has been forwarded to you, but in case not, I am forwarding it now so that it can be noted and placed on the website as an objection.

Regards,
Hugh Coster

Representing Aldwick East Ward,
Arun District Council

From: Jane Collins [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, November 17, 2019 2:21 pm

[REDACTED]

Subject: Inglenook Development

Dear Councillors

Inglenook Hotel Development Application for 9 dwellings

At the Development Control Meeting on the 6th November I spoke with others against this development on the issue of access and I am pleased that it was deferred for further assessment on Highways grounds which will hopefully also look at pedestrian safety. I represent 271 homes on Mill Farm Estate and in particular those that will be backing onto this development who live in single storey homes and will be most affected by the imposition of 2 storey houses. Many of my residents will be crossing the access point as pedestrians to get to the shops, bus stops and to use the zebra crossing. I am shocked that Highways consider it will have no impact on the local Highway network and does not consider pedestrian warning signage to be necessary within it, what about outside the access exit. Mr Crowther also stated that Highways have no control or responsibility for the access road unless or until it is adopted. So who exactly is to be accountable for the safety of pedestrians in this access road and crossing it if neither Agent nor Highways acknowledge the problem. There must exist a duty of care to consider the safety of all road users whether on the local highways or pavements or accessing the highway via any other route.

The Transport Statement provided by RGP (only two paragraphs) does not address fully the safety of vulnerable road users who will feel threatened by having no space protected from vehicles, particularly wheelchair and partially sighted users and children who will certainly be using the access to get to school and to the bus stop.

Mr Crowther's comments that the existing access 'is not ideal' and that 'if this were a new junction and access it would not be passed' is mystifying. It was a new access and junction at some point and presumably Highways were consulted originally. What happened? Does he really believe that exacerbating an already 'not ideal' situation by placing pedestrians in the lane and adding a further 46-48 vehicle movements is the right way forward.

He also stated that a planning application can be refused on Highways grounds but said 'you shouldn't' his reason being, as he has said many times, that it may result in an appeal which could involve a cost to ADC if overturned. Are you all prepared justify your decision to relatives if you get it wrong.

The lack of a 5 year housing supply has also resulted in a perceived vote of no confidence in the Local Plan. Would another 9 large 3 bedroom houses really help to address this given that Pagham is already being overwhelmed by a disproportionate 1250 houses. Should this be a reason to pass developments just to boost the numbers and in this instance one that will have an access which will be dangerous, potentially life threatening and untenable.

A recent article in the Bournemouth Echo of August 2018 concerning a planning application for 5 chalet bungalows which was refused by Committee and taken to appeal is very pertinent to the Inglenook proposal.

The Poole application also proposed to use a narrow access, albeit straight, which served only one home. Vehicles were able to turn within the site to exit in forward gear into a cul de sac. It had no bends or loss of site lines, no parking, bus stops or other busy junctions to contend with and did not exit directly into a busy local highway network.

I would ask that you take a few moments to read the following extracts from the Planning Officer comments along with the Planning Inspectors comments following his dismissal at appeal.

Planning officers rejected the scheme to demolish a bungalow and redevelop the site for five chalet bungalows prompting developer Holton Homes to launch an appeal. A statement submitted with its outline application at the end of last year said the existing driveway, with a new passing bay, would be suitable for the larger development.

Concerns were raised about it in addition to others being the "cramped" design and potential environmental harm. Council planning officer Sarah Scannell recommended refusal which included the following reason:-

"The access to the proposed development is substandard with regard to its narrow width, and lack of passing spaces. Therefore the proposal, which will utilise the existing substandard access as its sole access for pedestrians and vehicles, will fail to promote a safe and suitable access for all users and as a consequence the residential intensification of this access will result in increased highway and pedestrian safety dangers".

Holton Homes lodged an appeal in April saying there would be "no adverse impacts that would significantly outweigh the benefits" of its proposals.

Inspector Nick Davies backed the position of the council, despite disagreeing with its opposition to the design and environmental effects, he dismissed the appeal. He summed up with the following statement:-

Planning Balance

- 29. *I am mindful that the development would contribute to the government's objective of boosting the supply of homes, as expressed in paragraph 59 of the Framework. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the fact that 3-bedroomed market housing is identified at Figure 21 of the Local Plan as one of the most needed types of accommodation in the area.***
- 30. *The benefits of 5 dwellings are, however, limited and the Local Plan and the Framework both need to be considered as a whole. Whilst both support the provision of housing in sustainable locations, they also both seek to ensure that development is compatible with surrounding dwellings, and that there is safe and suitable access for all users. The limited benefits that would ensue from the development do not outweigh the harm that I have found regarding these matters.***

Mr Crowther advised the Committee that they shouldn't refuse this application on highways grounds but I hope the above decision indicates that a balance can be achieved. The consequences of this development will also be '**residential intensification**' and the risk of an appeal and the pressure of not meeting housing targets will not deter you from making the right decision to safely place the right type of homes in the right places.

Thank you for your time.

Jane Collins

Chair

Mill Farm Residents Association

Pagham