

The Potting Barn,
No5. Hobbs Curt
Bilsham Rd
Yapton, West Sussex
BN18 OJY

July1st 2021

Dear Mr. Davis,

I am objecting to application for the proposed development Y/71/21/OUT on the following grounds:

1. Proposed Additional buildings for 'light' industry.

I object to the proposal for the addition of 'light industry' because:

a) It would appear that any Outline Planning Proposal for the above should illustrate what exactly is proposed for the future regarding 'light industry', as this is not apparently included in the proposal.

Copious details appear to have been supplied in relation to *existing* 'light industry' activities, noise levels, dust and pollution instead.

The proposal does not appear to confirm what the 3 future units are intended to be used for. More of the same, an alternative, or even if the units are intended to be rented out to unspecified individuals and purposes, where any levels of noise or pollution of 'light industry' or ultimate use would be unknown too.

b) The site has already apparently been extended physically, and in use over time, and planning approved apparently retrospectively too. There is no perceived requirement for any further industry of any sort in the area/ location of the proposed plan, or as a specially required amenity for a housing development.

d) The registered *current* usage by HGV vehicles in and out of the site,(4 per hr as stated) does not appear to take into consideration future additional vehicular traffic to and from the site onto Bilsham Rd. from 3 additional units This would be in addition to any traffic from any proposed housing development.

e) The entrance to the industrial site is directly adjacent to Hobbs Farmhouse as a Grade II listed building. There is no mention in the proposal of several other Grade II listed properties in Hobbs Court adjacent to the Farmhouse, also in Bilsham Lane as well as Structures of Character in Bilsham Rd. The area of Bilsham dates back to the Domesday period.

f) There are other specially designated industrial sites in the area, on the A27 for sale or rent, towards Chichester, and also in the BN18 postcode area at North End Yapton, also in Littlehampton, and Bognor Regis, which would appear to allow for increase industrial use in those designated sites instead.

g) Also in relation to Grade II listed buildings, alleged **increased** pollution, (dust or other noxious particles) may affect brickwork and old mortar.

h) Increase of HGV lorries also includes vibration. Tests do not appear to have been done *on* the old buildings nearby to assess for detrimental effects by vehicles and machinery and other old buildings in close proximity to Hobbs Farmhouse and increase to 'light industrial' works which is not just noise and other pollution in relation to testing.

i). Additional lorries onto Bilsham Rd, are a concern, in relation to an already traffic congested area and also because of the close proximity to a blind bend at Hobbs Corner, an already notorious accident spot. Also other dangers at Comet Corner.

2. The the fields adjacent to the industrial site and proposed area for development.

I object on the basis of alleged detrimental outcomes, from any further industrial development, to sheep that have been grazing in neighbouring fields for many years. They are part of a local farmer's livelihood. Sheep are also susceptible to an excess of noise and also any form of dust or other pollution by any *increase* in levels, not apparently estimated at this time, only those of the present.

Loud or sudden noises can cause great distress to them, who can 'stampede'. Also any untoward external noises or upset can also cause the abortion of lambs. If sheep cannot safely graze it would appear to possibly sacrifice one business in favour of further 'industry' elsewhere. Increased background noise from any proposed housing development and construction may also be a consideration.

4. Housing allocations for Affordable Housing proportions for the Arun Area.

a) **I object** on the basis that although figures are apparently included in respect of affordable housing in relation to a development if granted, there appears to be no correlation or details specified in respect of total housing requirements in the Arun area.

Also, whether local areas and parishes have already met their targets, and whether other developments in the pipeline in the area would render this particular proposal unnecessary because of this. For example, Bonhams Field, Ford, and Loveys Road the latter of which if coming to fruition would also render further traffic congestion into Bilsham Rd. if an access is intended to be included from it.

b) Building requirements are understood not required to be in excess in any area should that prove to be the case.

c) More people, require increased infrastructure, which does not appear to accompany the development proposal. ie. a school/s, and doctor's surgeries.

5. Flooding

a) **I object** as it is not considered sufficient to refer only to the proposed site area, which is already acknowledged would require preventative flood measures, regarding any proposal for development in that area.

The water table is very high in the adjacent fields and areas where flooding is able to be seen during the winter months already. It would seem inadequate referencing to only allow for potential flood risk to the area of the proposal without consideration to the displacement of water to the water table to the immediate surrounding areas in result. Also in relation to how this may affect livestock in adjacent and neighbouring fields too.

A recommendation to raise floor levels in proposed development appears to be an acknowledgement of potential flood risk and as preventative. Unfortunately, the existing listed buildings in the area do not have such preventative measures.

6. Biodiversity

a) **I object** because I am unsure when any investigation into local bird population was taken, but it would seem that the list submitted is rather short. Within the radius as quoted and in my garden nearby: crow, jackdaw, owl, robin, goldfinch, robin, wren, warblers, sparrows/ buntings, starling, woodpeckers green and pied, blackbird, thrush, magpie, blue tit, great tit, long tailed tit, swallow, swift, red kite, buzzard, other smaller hawks, pheasant, duck and moorhen. Also different types of gull who also frequent open fields for shelter and feeding. In open fields there will also be other additions. If reviews were taken during the nesting season Feb-April in particular, many birds will be on nests in hedgerows and so not necessarily prevalent to view. Pipistrel and other bats are usually seen at dusk.

b) Open fields also have wildflowers and grasses, on which all the biodiversity benefits both birds or invertebrates, They do not all live permanently in the hedgerows and trees. The reduction in field flowers also reduces pollinating insects including bees and butterflies which is required for a healthy environment for all. Suggesting that fields are 'redundant' because they do not currently sustain livestock or used for other purposes, is not the whole story. Keeping areas of open countryside as they are, is not to enhance 'views' or even necessarily for 'pleasure'. Pollinating insects are a requirement for our food production and all the animals and birds are all part of the ecosystem for our survival too. It is suggested that the 'need for housing' is not outweighed by the need for green spaces and fields to be retained in the area. 'Redundant fields' are suggested can still be used for food production for example instead, or left to enhance the ecosystem.

7. Allotments and Green spaces

7a) I object that the proposed plan only shows 34 allotments ,,,,,,,,,,,,,, and no area for parking.

There is an apparent need for more allotments in the area generally, and because some have already been lost in result of the Crayfern development at Cinders Lane. There would seem a general need to balance these losses and with an increased population generally. 34 is considered to be inadequate to any proposed development. As a rural community, allotments provide the opportunity for healthy outdoor activity and organic growing opportunities, which would also seem to need to be equal to those of increased building development.

b) If any development is anticipated to take place, perhaps a 'Buffer Zone' of green space existing housing and any proposed development plans for that area would seem to offer a better plan all round. Biodiversity and a more rural outlook maintained, and as a potential benefit to the village.

c) There appears to be an area of possible pond/water included in the development. If so, it would require being maintained (by who?) and also a consideration that it may be an unsafe environment for small children, and a possible magnet for rubbish dumping.

8.Archaology

I object that as yet no archaeology has been advised in the area as recommended by the report submitted, which advised that nothing further should be done until this had been undertaken because of earlier settlement possibilities for review.

9. Highways report

a) I object, because the indications from WSCC do not appear to take into consideration some aspects of the area in its recommendations.

b) It appears to advise a connecting pavement from the new development to Yapton for cycling and footfall from the area of GLW to Taylors Close to access Yapton.

This was already been investigated in the earlier plan submitted for that area last year, which was rejected by Arun District Council and Yapton Parish Council and also by Conservation on the grounds of urbanisation.

c) The details submitted indicated that there is already footfall/footpath with indications of 'access' along the verges from GLW to Taylors Close. This would appear to be misleading in outcome. While it is acknowledged that the verges are able to be walked on, the assessment is questioned regarding to both need and use.

A more recent site visit would not appear to support the report claim by WSCC. An actual record of footfall would give an accurate picture, rather than an apparent assumption. There is a small portion of worn area to the verge from the Hobbs Court entrance for approx. 50yds up the road, used infrequently by dog walkers to access the footpath across the road at that point, not to and from Yapton..

It is noted from a plan submitted that there are footpaths indicated to the top of the proposed development site. It would seem logical that they would be used as nearer to Yapton and converted to cycle tracks if necessary instead.

In the region of the proposed bell opening to Bilsham Rd there is already a tarmacked footpath by turning left, that accesses the purpose- built cycle track on the A259. The next turning on the left is a road straight into Yapton too. It is legal to ride on pavements, and perhaps more cost effective than making pavements and cycle tracks elsewhere.

d) It can also be observed that going towards GLW round the bend at the junction of Hobbs Corner and Bilsham Lane that there is no evidence of footfall round that bend and towards Grevatts Lane West. The indications of wear at that bend is not footfall

but the ingress of vehicles avoiding each other. See also under b and attachment to show actual ingress and damage.

- a) Also not apparently and allegedly under consideration is that WSCC do not own all the 'historic' verges and ditches in the area, from GLW to Taylors Close, and in particular from Taylors Close round the bend at Hobbs Corner towards GLW.

WSCC only own the first metre in from the road, and with the required width for any such proposed pavement/cycle way would necessitate encroaching onto private land owned by the adjacent properties in each case.

This would appear to involve from Taylors Close to Grevatts Lane West, including the entrance to the allotments in Bilsham Rd., part of a copse, trees and hedges, considerable areas of verges, 'historic' ditches, an owner dropped kerb entrance, which it is necessary to park on in order to open a gate, and whereby it is not permitted to block a pavement. Continuing round the corner also involves private property ownership and may also require the removal of part of some front gardens/verges in Bilsham Rd. towards GLW too.

This area was also under consideration recently for an earlier proposal to the same development site for an approximate sum of £98,000 in an S106, but the money was allocated elsewhere. This figure would appear did not include any purchase costs of owner land to approx. a dozen properties that would be 'involved' in such a suggestion.

Nor would it appear to eliminate the responsibility for the maintenance and responsibility for existing ditches, nor the increase of run-off water because of tarmac into the ditches. The Environment Agency not apparently in favour of culverts(pipes) which would require additional cost too.

- b) Hobbs Corner is notoriously dangerous, where serious accidents and 2 deaths have occurred in recent times. A site visit will confirm the ingress onto the verge where busses and other vehicles have mounted it to avoid hitting each other. See enclosed attachment, which shows where the inclusion of kerbstones have already been crushed into the ground because of this.
- c) To encourage increased footfall and cycles onto a pavement to increase any activity in that area would not eliminate vehicles mounting a kerb, or eliminate any inherent dangers, but allegedly increase them instead.
- d) The suggestion that cycle tracks are needed for people to get around the village is also not apparently born out by the local figures submitted for the Local Area Neighbourhood Plan consultation, which indicated that most individuals work outside the village, and use cars in order to get there, cycling being only a very small percentage. Cycling apparently being more for recreation, rather than necessity and there is already a road. A sign on the A259 indicating that the cycling time to Chichester time is approximately 50 mins. also indicating approx 2hrs travel time to and from work which may not be desired by many.

Most work in Yapton, being accessible on foot and local amenities on foot too. Shopping of any magnitude cannot be accommodated easily on a bicycle.

- e) It is also interesting to note, that the multi-million pound cycle track on the A259 between Chichester to Ferring, that the Chichester to Yapton stretch has apparently been reduced in width by about half in some areas apparently due to over growth and lack of maintenance. It does not say in the highways report who is intended either to fund any suggested pavement/cycle track/footpath in the area, nor who would pay for its future upkeep either. An S106 would allegedly have to be agreed to be supplied by any proposed developer as an addition to the proposed site. Too early for outline as understood, but should perhaps be part of an overall consideration, as WSCC have alluded to a pavement already. Although not directly in the proposal.

9. Sewers

I object because it appears that only desktop appraisals have been undertaken for the area and in result of any proposed additional development in that regard.

10. The plan as a whole

I object , because from the plans available on the website it is not possible to ascertain exactly what some of the 'buildings' are. 2 or 3 stories for example.

It would seem that it would perhaps be possible to place green or allotment areas between existing houses and industrial site, if any application was to go ahead to create a natural barrier between what already exists, and any new development by an alteration to the site plans. Less houses and more amenable spaces/ less pollution and noise and risk to existing properties in any planning application to go forward in that area too.

In conclusion: an industrial site augmentation is not required, and development in such an area as unsuitable for the many reasons of concern as stated.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough



Google