

From

08/12/2017

Mr Ian M Langmead  
Little Rookery  
Hoe Lane  
Flansham

LAND AT BONHAMS Y/40/17/OUT

Simon Davis  
Arun District Council  
Maltravers St  
Littlehampton

Dear Mr Davis

I am writing once again in regard to the proposed development on the land of Bonhams, which lies opposite my own property. As previously stated I considered this site quite unsuitable for development.

I am probably the oldest inhabitant in the village and have lived here all of my life, First at Flansham House and then here at Little Rookery. I have seen development in the village, all to the enhancement of this Hamlet, many redundant farm buildings being tastefully restored into living accommodation in keeping with the rural surrounds. The owner of Bonhams obviously has no interest in the village as he has had his own property downgraded from a Category 2 listed building so as to enable him to build in his garden.

Little Rookery entrance is within yards of the Bonhams entry the only one available for the proposed development.

As all residents know the entrance into Hoe Lane from the A259 roundabout is hazardous at the best of times, even so that two large cars have to mount the pavement to pass, let alone large lorries and construction vehicles carrying building materials and such onto the site. No doubt there will be many an accident and many occasions that the residents will not be able to exit the lane because of blockages and congestion. Remember there is only the one entrance to the site, which is quite unsuitable and would normally be turned down automatically by the Council/Planning office. It seems odd that this has not already happened!

It appears that the Arun District Council has gone against earlier policies which stated that there would be No development north of the new A259 bypass. This alone does not give one too much faith in the Planning Committee

Next I would like to add that too many houses are being built in the area with no regard to the impact on the existing facilities i.e. schools, transport, doctors hospitals etc.

I do suggest Mr. Davis that you read Mr Adames letter carefully as he has covered all of these points very well.

I would like to suggest the you and colleagues view the site when I could be present. Failing that a courtesy call or letter in reply to this letter would be appreciated.

Regards

Ian Langmead