

[REDACTED]

From: GEOFF FARRELL [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 7:30:19 PM
To: Christopher Cooper
Cc: Cllr. Martin Lury
Subject: Re: Planning application Y/103/18/PL

Chris- Andy Mouland says that there are 150 cyclists per day. 75 each way as recorded by the cycle counter (now fully working)

Geoff

Sent from my iPhone

On 5 Jul 2019, at 18:29, Christopher Cooper [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Councillor Lury,

I have very deep concerns about the above planning application, both in terms of process and content.

On May 17th the Applicant's Agent wrote: 'Given the Council are proposing to support the proposal.....' It is very important for the public, and particularly for those opposing the application, that the source for this assumption on the Agent's part is explained. The Applicant is a wealthy local landowner and, no doubt, very influential. But the words of the Agent make it appear that there has been an arrangement behind closed doors. Indeed the correspondence between Ms Jackson and Mr Davis is remarkable for the use of first

names. I know that emails tend towards informality but in such controversial matters it is inappropriate.

Also in terms of process, on June 25th the Agent expressed annoyance that she had not received the courtesy of an apology for the postponement of the Committee meeting scheduled for June 27th. Yet just three days before that meeting she submitted a 57 page document, not allowing reasonable time for the committee or the public to consider the intricacies of the contents. That is gross discourtesy, even contempt for the opponents of the application.

The Traffic Consultants describe the present access to the planned crematorium to be 'informally closed by a gate'. What does that mean? Presumably it was closed decades ago to satisfy someone's interests and now it is to be reopened, presumably also to satisfy those same interests. Again, the public need to see clearly that one party's interests are not served at the expense of others'. Is such a closure legal? Is a similar opening legal? When the cycle path was planned, built, and now in constant use - it is a huge asset to sustainable transport - there was not the slightest hint that it would or could be jeopardized by such a junction.

In terms of content of the application, the traffic and cycling figures quoted are unrealistic. I have pointed out two such examples in the attached objection, already sent in to the Planning Department via 'Comments'. Anyone who drives or cycles along the A259 between Comet Corner and the Oyster Catcher junction knows how busy this road is. The figures quoted, e.g. for the expected waiting times for drivers wishing to turn right into the proposed crematorium, belong in the world of fantasy. I was cycling today next to the road and there was constant traffic in both directions, indeed it was very slow moving by the Oyster Catcher because of sheer number of vehicles. As I have shown in the attachment, the figures for cycle usage are disingenuous, having been garnered on cold days in February, one of the two days being a Sunday! The crematorium is not to be used on a Sunday! I think 'disingenuous' is a kind word!

The plans include over 110 parking spaces, yet only an average of 19 vehicle movements in and out, i.e. 38 per service, are envisaged. This is sheer guesswork. There could be over 1000 vehicle movements across the cycle track every day. The proposed junction would be extremely dangerous, particularly to cyclists travelling eastwards as they will find it difficult, even impossible to assess cars turning left across their path. Of course, such cars would have to wait in just the same way that cyclists, if on the road, God forbid (!) would have priority over any vehicle turning left.

Users of the shared path have been totally ignored in spite of the many objections raised by cyclists, indeed also by non cyclists who recognize the resulting dilemma of users of this shared path. It really is essential that priority is maintained for pedestrians, users of invalid carriages and cyclists. But such priority is not even mentioned in the application.

I attach herewith the objection that I have sent to ADC via the 'Comments' button. I should be most grateful if you could draw attention to this letter and also the attachment to other Councillors. I also look forward to receiving your reply. I am sure that you will have some facts with which to answer my points, particularly on the process issues that I have raised.

The objection made in the attachment has the blessing of both the Bognor Regis Cycle Forum and the West Sussex Cycle Forum.

Best wishes

Christopher Cooper

<Crematorium Objection to Y.docx>