

The Potting Barn
No.5, Hobbs Court
Bilsham Rd.

Yapton, West Sussex BN18 OJY

Aug.18th 2020

Objection to Outline Planning Application Y/20/70/ OUT.

My objections to the application are on the following grounds.

1. Grade II Listed Buildings

I object that the proposed application does not apparently adequately address the nature of the close proximity of a settlement of Grade II Listed properties at Hobbs Court adjacent to it. It appears that there is only a 'passing reference' at this time. The Hobbs Court site contains 6 Grade II listed buildings, a 7th is a carport block, also understood to maintain the same status. There appears to be no recognition in the proposed development plan in respect the overall historic interest in relation to this, except apparently to acknowledge that this may be a consideration at some stage. No report appropriate to this aspect has apparently and currently been included in terms of assessment at this time either.

In addition, **I object** to the proposed close positioning of additional industrial premises adjacent to this historic site because of this. I also object because I am an owner of one of the said properties of Grade II listing, where compliance has already been required to be upheld because of this status.

2. Setting out of the Proposal

I object on the basis that even though this application is for Outline Planning approval, some details supplied in the application are not able to apparently be confirmed, on the following grounds:

- a) Old and out of date maps/plans submitted, do not apparently reflect the correct and current status of the area of proposed development regarding those who may be affected by it.
- b) Properties involved, either incorrectly notated/named or not included at all.
- c) A 'Footpath' is indicated but there is apparently an ambiguity as to whether this is in fact a reference to the existing *grass walkway*, or whether it is intended to be replaced as a permanent footpath by tarmac or other permanent inclusion.
- d) Entrance into Bilsham Rd. from property apparently affected by the proposal, but not named or shown in relation to the 'footpath' area. (The Potting Barn No5. Hobbs Court).

As this entrance has been recently installed and approved with a tarmac, dropped kerb, and soakaway, it is questioned as to how this would be intended to be incorporated into a permanent footpath if it is in fact intended to be introduced.

d) If intended to be tarmac/other path also, no indication is given as to apparent consideration regarding possible increased water ingress onto property ownership of adjacent verge and ditch because of flow-off from tarmac. Apart from approx. 1 metre width, apparently owned by the council from the road edge, the verges and ditches are all owned by adjacent properties, (6, and

not indicated on the plan in association either, but apparently indicating that there is plenty of room on the verges for a footpath).

f) No indication as to who would be responsible for constructing and maintenance of said footpath for the future, if it is to be introduced, ie., either developer or local authority, or in fact possible 'red herring' because of considered unclear information given in details in respect of that area, as to what form if any such footpath would take or remain as grass .

3.Flood Risks

a) **I object** on the basis that the Flood Report advises within it that it is a 'desktop survey' only and based on 'modelling' examples. There are no details supplied by the local water authority or drains, in addition, or other figures concerning local flooding (as suggested should be reviewed independently *in* the report, but are not included at this time) nor in relation to the effect on local and historic *drainage ditches* that currently serve to assist with run off and underground water levels in respect of the main proposed development area fields and surrounds.

b) **I also object** to these finding on the basis that they do not mention general flooding covering the area of the fields in the area of the proposed development over the past two years nor make reference to the fact that some fields in that area were covered by water apparently for weeks, earlier in 2020. I own a field in that area and was able to witness this myself. I feel that only local knowledge/local authority bodies could confirm such details, rather than a desk top survey to be relied on for a full review. Also, and in consideration of other apparently out of date information supplied, it is questioned that although the date for this report is 'recent', it is concerning because appears to omit these more recent and apparently important details regarding flooding in the area at this time.

c) **I also object** on the basis that although the survey mainly relates to any possible disadvantages through potential flooding risk to the proposed development site, there is apparently no in depth reportage as to how such a development would impact on the water levels to the immediate environment beyond, and because of it.

d) **I object** , because the flood report does not appear to allow for any possible flood risk that may be generated *by* the development, to surrounding fields or properties, in particular Grade II Listed ones, and not in the immediate development plan generally. Also absent is any reference to any impact in the case of neighbouring fields to the proposed development, currently grazed by sheep and equine animals, or any other biodiversity by way of report. Also, no consideration apparently regarding potential impact either during any construction or subsequently regarding noise or any other air pollution that may be generated, either during a development or subsequently by 'industry' as unspecified. It may be that this is an 'outline' planning application, but without underlying factors also considered at this time, it would not seem to reflect what are understood to be important factors too. It may be argued that these are factors would come up with regard to a formal application, but if approval is given now on the basis of a possibly incomplete survey, it is understood to be more difficult to rescind them.

3.The Road from the A259

a). **I object** on the basis that the Highway Report to accompany this application was compiled as dated April 12th 2017, and also apparently relies on detailing from 2012. Because of increase in local traffic in the last 3 years **I object** on the basis that it is not felt that this information can be

relied upon as a true reflection of the present traffic flow, or numbers of vehicles per day and over specific times.

b) **I object** on the following grounds in relation the to report:

The existing road surface quality, is not mentioned in the report. Especially from Comet Corner (Yapton Rd. to Bilsham Rd.) Its *current status*, let alone an estimated increase in volume of traffic (now considered far greater in reality after 3 additional years of usage, than in the Highways Report from 017 as submitted) is of concern. It appears to be pitted and patched, and in need of repair already.

b) **I object** because the report only refers to traffic density, usage and incidents from 2012 to 017. Traffic volume has increased in the areas mentioned in any event since those times, at best 3 years later, at worst 8 as applicable. The report is not felt to be representative of the present situation in result.

c) **I object** that report does not include any vehicular impact from additional development in the area generally since 017: Burndell Rd, Cinders Lane and behind the Co- op for example. Also in prospect, the additional development site yet to completed at the top end of Bilsham Rd, (Martlet Hyde apparent involvement), with the anticipated introduction of approximately 300 houses additionally in the area to the Northwest, which would appear would need access/use down Bilsham Rd and to the A259 as well. The additional vehicles that such a development would command is not factored in either for the present an immediate future, and figures from 017, do not appear to reflect the current position or anticipated immediate increase in traffic.

d) **I object** that the Highways Report appears to consider that increased traffic would appear to be minimal, without consideration being given to the increased difficulties to those already existing, that would ensue at Comet Corner, where there is also a constant backlog of cars already trying to join the A259 even at the present time. Often with queues that stretch back to past where Yapton Road becomes Bilsham Rd. and also on occasions back as far as Hobbs Farmhouse, in the region of a sharp bend in the road.

e) **I also object on the basis** that under item 9 on the report, that it indicates that any further difficulties that may ensue would be deferred byway of a roundabout scheduled for 2031, when it appears that there are problems at present.

The report also indicates that local authority improvements would resolve current difficulties (017) access to and from the A259 at Comet Corner. I contend that these difficulties regarding turning right across the A259 have not been resolved by these improvements, and that the details in the report are out of date and therefore 'misleading' as traffic in that area has increased anyway over three years too.

f) **I object** on the basis that if the Highways Report is apparently intended to be used towards a decision-making process now, that it cannot be relied upon, as out of date and alleged as 'misleading' at this time. A more up to date one would appear to be required, which should reflect the current position of 'traffic' in an open and transparent way, and to allow relevant objections to be raised from the present and not the past.

g)). **I also object** that in the Highways Report under item7, apparently alleged as 'misleading' in respect of the current use and topography of Bilsham Rd and its apparent lack of impediment as the report appears to indicate.

h) **I object** because the report refers to 'a gentle bend' at the point where Grevatts Lane has a junction with Bilsham Rd. Unfortunately, it fails to mention additionally and just beyond, is a very sharp bend a few yards further to the right at the point where there is also a junction to Bilsham Lane from Bilsham Rd. So 'difficult' in fact is the traversing of that corner that when two vehicles have to pass by in opposite directions that there is a large area of the mown grass verge which has received damage from the ingress of many of them over time to endeavour to pass each other safely.

h,i) **I object** that also absent in the Highways Report, is a *full* account of accidents have occurred at that bend in recent times and up to 2020 particularly. The report indicates from 2012 and 'In the last 5 years' from that date, and apparently only up to and including April 12th 2017.

ii) More recent accidents are as follows:-

A car apparently came round the same bend, lost control and ploughed into the wall of a property at Hobbs Court. There was another incident with a motor cyclist, and a cyclist all in the same approximate place in recent times.

At the present time it is already understood that to exit onto Bilsham Rd, from Hobbs Farmhouse is partially obstructed by the same sharp bend, and any proposed increase to access to the neighbouring property for industrial vehicles are anticipated will also have the same difficulty. (not the same apparently additional access proposed further down Bilsham Rd.) There is very little time duration to see a vehicle when exiting from the farmhouse and onto Bilsham Rd. from the same bend. It is anticipated that the proposed increase in industrial traffic to the new industrial properties, will increase any possible dangers incrementally.

iii) **I object Item 8** that refers to the bus service, which is correct, but does not mention its difficulties negotiating the aforesaid bend, and using the verges for avoidance of oncoming traffic, or exiting on to the A269 from Comet Corner when turning right. The apparent encouraging of footfall in such an area of concern too by the possible proposed introduction of a footpath there, would not appear to have been considered at this time either.

iv) **I object** to the speed limit of 40mph down the road from Taylors Close to the bend at Bilsham Lane, as this seems to encourage greater speed down the longer stretch towards it, which is mainly where the accidents have occurred. I would object to that speed limit continuing and suggest that it is reduced to 30 mph in the event of increased traffic.

4. Proposed Amenities to the development

a) A green area is shown and a 'Village Hall' and playground.

I object to this on the basis that there appears to be no car park advised in relation to the 'Village Hall' which if included and would appear to reduce any area of green in result. Footfall on only a green area with no hardstanding towards a local amenity building would seem unworkable.

b) **I object** to this because Yapton already has a village hall (apparently with possible room to expand if necessary), and is in a village already, and the new development is not described as a 'village' concept but is appearing in the development plan as an area of 'separate identity'. To indicate the creation of an independent area to an existing village, is considered divisive, and the antithesis of the concept of inclusivity into an already existing community.

I also object because what is advised is not an unencumbered 'open space' or park (which would be encouraged) where there are trees and paths and grass to encourage wildlife and

nature and as a place for children to freely run around in,(not a playground which has limitations and has maintenance costs), and for residents to walk, or exercise dogs in .Perhaps a far less expensive outcome than the maintenance and running of a 'village hall', which may not be possible to effect in the first place for reasons of cost and continued maintenance. **I would object** if this green space was later removed to be replaced by additional housing as possibly perceived alternative.

I object on the basis that a green space should be a green space and not encumbered, so as to attract as much flora and fauna as possible instead and, so that children can learn and experience what the countryside has to offer, by natural rather than by artificial means.

b). **I object** on the basis that although the local store is a great plus to the community (in Bilsham Rd.) That area is already often 'blocked' by two- way traffic has not apparently been addressed in terms of increased traffic in relation to the proposed development.

c). **I object** that there is no apparent indication as to where an influx of children are to be schooled as a result through the development with the addition of possibly 200 children to the community. If there is land 'to spare' perhaps the introduction of a junior school to assist a growing population may be a considered option to the development instead? Right next to a park where they can play too?

d)**I object** that there appears to be no consideration for added medical coverage by doctor's surgeries, for an influx of intended increased population, and there is apparently inadequate parking to doctor's surgeries already.

It is accepted that everyone has the right to apply for any application for development as they so wish and which is respected, but in making any application, it is also understood that correct, verifiable, and up to date details should be presented in corroboration, in order that all those reviewing such an application have a full and realistic picture for assessment.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough

The Potting Barn, No 5 Hobbs Court, Bilsham Rd. Yapton West Sussex BN18 OJY.