



Arun District Bridleways Group

Please reply to:
Julie Robinson
Bilsham Manor
Bilsham Lane
Yapton
West Sussex
BN18 0JX

12 May 2021

For the attention of Planning Officer Simon Davis - Sent via email to: Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk

Dear Mr Davis

Re: Land East of Drove Lane – Y/49/21/RES

It is very disappointing to note that the new application that has been submitted has come back still with no provision for the multi-user Canal Greenway route as many people requested and as supported by the ADC Conservation Officer, or any attempt to cater for local equestrians.

We do not agree with your assessment contained within your comments within the refusal of the last reserved matters application implying that local people “cannot agree” on what they want in respect of the Canal Greenway. We believe the only difference of opinion was in regard to whether the hedge which now exists between the canal bed and the towpath (footpath 200-1) should be removed or not, rather than whether the towpath should be upgraded and a route provided through the site and via an upgraded footpath 157 from Main Road to facilitate the Greenway. There is no disagreement over that, and the same is contained within the revised Yapton Neighbourhood Plan multi-user network. There would seem to be no reasonable reason not to provide it either – there is ample space to do so along the “canal green” and make a new link to an upgraded FP 157, and it surely makes sense when the original landowner was obligated under a Section 106 Agreement to upgrade the right of way along the canal within his ownership as it continues to the west?

We also object to the lack of any routes for equestrians (which the Greenway could contribute to) within the application which only caters for walkers and cyclists. This is against all local policy as set out below (bold sections, our emphasis):

a) The ADC Local Plan Policy T DM1 – bullet point d.

“contribute towards the provision of a joined up cycle network and Public Rights of Way network, taking into account the aspirational cycle network, which provides convenient, accessible, safe, comfortable and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists, **and where appropriate, horse riders**, both within the development and in the form of links between the development”.

If this large site with its rural aspect adjoining open countryside, and which has nearby local land use which is heavily equestrian is not “appropriate” then we would ask where exactly would be regarded as “appropriate”?

b) The ADC Local Plan – Transport para. 15.2.5

“One of the strategic priorities of the strategy is to make the District exceptionally good for cycling and other activities that are best off road **like horse riding**, running and cycling”

c) The Arun Design Guide SPD 2021

Page 45 “Make Sure that the Scheme

- “includes spaces for people to meet, play and interact and creates a user friendly layout for non-motorised users of all abilities including pedestrians, cyclists, **equestrians** and wheelchair users”.

Page 50

“A successful movement framework should be easily accessible by all including the young, elderly and those with movement difficulties; and should encourage healthy and sustainable choices, making it as easy to walk, cycle, **horse ride** or take public transport as it is to drive”.

Page 51

“Pedestrian, cycle or equestrian routes may be provided alongside (but separated from) those for traffic, or through dedicated cycle ways, footpaths, **bridleways and multi-user tracks**, linked with surrounding strategic networks (eg. public rights of way, National Cycle Network)”.

“Most villages on the coastal plain within Arun District have horse paddocks and stables on the urban fringe. The provision of bridleways to link with the coastal plain, as identified within the West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028 is encouraged”.

“Movement Framework – Make Sure that the Scheme (amongst the various bullet points under this head)

- Provides a connected and convenient network of streets, footways, cycle paths, **bridleways, public rights of way and access routes which follow desire lines**
- **Incorporates existing routes to enable ease of movement beyond the development**
- Incorporates the provision of dedicated shared cycle and pedestrian routes **or bridleways** alongside and beyond roadways

Below is a link to YouTube video drone footage of the canal route from Lidsey to Yapton. It clearly demonstrates the extensive equestrian land use along the north edge of the canal along this section. Please view this and understand therefore the frustration and anger felt by local equestrians at the level of discrimination, bias and lack of care for their safety demonstrated by the continued lack of attention to their needs in terms of provision of safe off-road routes for them, whilst they see other users being catered for. Despite all the policies supporting the need for routes for equestrians on the coastal plain, this large strategic site adjoining the countryside is currently contributing nothing for them. That is surely a disgrace.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=85SgTDUmI5Q&feature=share&fbclid=IwAR0C1oFOtsrQkEIi2NhZVPVNrln06xnrQ7zKnGdpc2OqnvVK5MYmfJhJ6WQ>

d) The West Sussex Rights of Way Management Plan 2018-2028

Page 6

“... the coastal plain has virtually no suitable access for horses”

Page 7

“The paths on the coastal plain are mainly footpaths so there are very limited opportunities for users other than walkers. Being highly populated, the roads are busy and, despite the flat terrain, off-road cycling or horse riding opportunities are very limited”.

In various places later in this Plan it is noted that development schemes will be the best means of achieving improvements in the situation (by new routes & upgrades of PROW) and these should aim to be as inclusive as possible.

Bearing in mind all of the above policy, and that over 70% of cyclists are male, whereas over 85% of horse riders are female, we submit that the application as designed demonstrates a lack of regard to these policies and additionally fails on grounds of equal opportunity, inclusion and gender bias.

This could, however, easily be resolved by a simple re-design to provide a route for the Greenway as requested, at bridleway status, and by making the proposed “cycleways”

instead into bridleways (which require the same width) thus contributing to the local availability of safe off-road routes open to both cyclists **and** horse riders.

We very much hope you will be instrumental in encouraging the developer to make these changes to the scheme as currently designed and therefore make a good scheme that caters adequately for local needs and is outward and not just inwardly focussed. This is essential for an improved communication network going forward, enabling active travel by various modes and therefore the future health and well being of all residents.

Yours sincerely

Julie Robinson (Mrs)
Chair – Arun District Bridleways Group