

Bilsham Manor
Bilsham Lane
Yapton
Nr Arundel
West Sussex
BN18 0JX



D. Easton Esq
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF

24 January 2018

Dear Sir

**RE: OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS Y/91/17/OUT AND Y/92/17/OUT /
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OFF BILSHAM ROAD AND DROVE LANE,
YAPTON**

Although these are two separate applications, they jointly comprise the entirety of the proposed Strategic Site Yapton SD7 identified within the emerging Arun District Local Plan 2011 - 2031 and it is logical to assume that they will be considered in tandem. For this reason, these representations are submitted as an objection to both applications, individually and collectively.

Application Y/91/17/OUT is for a total of 250 dwellings and application Y/92/17/OUT is for up to a further 300 dwellings.

1. General Overview of Recent Development Applications and Permissions

- 1.1. The Yapton Neighbourhood Plan 2014 - 2029 (YNP) was prepared over a period of some two years and eventually resulted in a 95% majority of local residents in favour of its proposed allocations for residential development in October 2014 and the YNP was "made" on 5th November 2014. This allocated sites for a minimum of 100 dwellings to be accommodated within the Plan period.
- 1.2. During the evolution of the YNP, two sites were identified as suitable for development on 1.06ha North of Yapton Primary School and 2.04ha at Cinders Lane, collectively anticipated as suitable for 50 dwellings. In the event outline planning permission was granted on the first for 38 dwellings and, on the second, there are currently two undecided outline planning applications for a total of 70 dwellings.
- 1.3. Also during the evolution of the YNP two other sites received outline planning permission:

(a) Land North of Burndell Road, Yapton, for 173 dwellings approved on appeal on 19th December 2011 and,

(b) Land South of Fellows Gardens, Yapton, for 34 dwellings approved on 19th December 2013.

1.4. Consequently, the YNP allocations, plus these two permissions, provide land for some 315 dwellings; 215% above the YNP requirement as voted upon by Yapton residents

1.5. Since the "making" of the YNP, a further four planning applications have either been approved or are currently the subject of outstanding, undecided applications:

(a) Land off Burndell Road, Yapton, for 108 dwellings approved, on appeal, on 13th October 2017 under Ref: Y/19/16/OUT

(b) Land South of Ford Lane, Yapton, for 100 dwellings approved, on appeal, on 15th January 2018 under Ref: Y/80/16/OUT.

(c) Land at Stakers Farm, North End Road, Yapton, for 70 dwellings, currently undecided but understood likely to be approved, under Ref: Y/44/17/OUT, and

(d) Land at Street Buildings, North End Road, Yapton, for 45 dwellings, currently undecided but understood likely to be approved, under Ref: Y/49/17/OUT.

1.6. These sites, if all approved, will add a further 323 dwellings to the 315 referred to above, taking the total to 538% above the YNP requirement as voted upon by Yapton residents.

1.7. It is to be noted that, notwithstanding that two sites were identified in the YNP, all six of these sites were departures from the Development Plan.

1.8. It is against this background that I am objecting to yet a further 550 dwellings on the two sites the subject of this submission.

2. Other Grounds of Objection

2.1. Yapton currently suffers severe traffic congestion in two principal locations. The first is in North End Road in the vicinity of Yapton Primary School where, at morning drop-off and afternoon collection times there is virtual gridlock. The second is at the Comet Corner junction of Yapton Road with the A259 where, at peak times, traffic backs up for 200m or more leading to impatience and numerous accidents. These traffic pinch-points are extant and will inevitably get worse as and when the new developments listed in 1 - 6 above get built out. To add traffic from a yet further 550 dwellings onto this already over-congested road network, without any real and clear improvement schemes to overcome them, would be irresponsible in the extreme. In the event that these applications are recommended for approval, **it is essential that solutions to these pre-existing problems are identified, imposed upon the developers and carried out before any development commences.** Additionally, Southern Water have made it clear there is insufficient capacity for any of these developments.

2.2. Bearing in mind the affect on the safety of Yapton village centre already being seen by the development of the former nursery sites along the Yapton Road in Barnham parish, and the cumulative affect which will be seen by the granting of the

permissions in para. 1 above, the choice of these sites for a further large residential development also seems to have been particularly poorly thought through.

- 2.3. Both sites comprise high grade agricultural land upon which there is a presumption against development.
- 2.4. The sites form part of larger agricultural holdings which can be farmed more economically than smaller units. Consequently, the commercial viability of the residual land will be diminished.
- 2.5. Once Brexit occurs there will need to be greater reliance upon food sources derived from within the UK to avoid the inevitable tariffs on imports from overseas.
- 2.6. The site of Y/92/17/OUT abuts the Yapton Main Road & Church Lane Conservation Area and contains part of the route of the Portsmouth & Arundel Canal, further deteriorating the value and setting of both and against stated policies in the Local Plan. In fact my points 2.2 to 2.6 all identify issues contrary to policies under 7. in the Local Plan - Settlement Structure and Green Infrastructure.
- 2.7. It is noted that the proposed developments are to provide additional/improved facilities for local pedestrian and cycle links between the sites and Yapton, Barnham, Climping, Ford and beyond, but **no mention is made of creating routes for horse riders**. At least one of the applicant/landowners owns adjoining land that could be required to incorporate horse-riding facilities that, with improvements to the on-site provisions, could enable a bridleway link to be created between Yapton, Barnham and Flansham. There are currently **NO** facilities for the many horse riders in this part of the Coastal Plain and this development, if permitted, would provide an ideal opportunity to start to address this deficiency.

(a) In the Local Plan under 15.1.1., the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011-2026 outlines under Key Transport Issues in the District "the public rights of way network between the South Downs National Park and the Coast is disjointed and deficient in bridleway access".

(b) Your own policies under 15.2.5 states that it is a strategic priority to "make the District a fantastic place for cycling and things that are best off road like horse riding ..."

(c) Policy T DM1 states that "Proposals for all new development must: (d) provide 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...". It would be hard to find a place that is more "appropriate" than this for the inclusion of equestrians on routes, bearing in mind the proximity of many equestrians nearby, both in Yapton and Barnham and the lack of any facilities currently for them.

(d) I would further add to this that there is a need to make east/west connections and not just north/south ones.

However, without a joined up approach to the implementation of the stated policies above by making such provision through development and, instead, adopting a policy of exclusion, the net effect of all this development will be the diminution of the sport of horse riding in the District. This will be to the detriment of those who wish to continue to enjoy it for recreation and to all the local employment and businesses locally dependant upon the equine leisure sector. Paths that are **genuinely multi-**

user need to be created for the benefit of all vulnerable non-motorised users. Such paths are well received and bolster community cohesion and tolerance between user groups.

- 2.8. A recent vote by Yapton residents on future development proposals highlighted Maypole Field as an area where, if they had to accept additional development, they would find more acceptable. Maypole Field is not crossed by any public rights of way and is not an area of particular beauty and history like these two application sites. Its loss for residential development would therefore affect Yapton residents less. Additionally, new residents here could access the A27 without adding to the issues of congestion by the school and, additionally, could easily access either Barnham or Ford railway stations by using Lake Lane or Ford Lane. Its affect on the safety of the village roads would therefore be significantly less than these two application sites. Additionally, it has clear boundaries.
- 2.9. It is inevitable that, if approved, these development would, in time, lead to further applications to extend the developments further to the west and south which, in time, would lead to the coalescence of Yapton and Barnham and Yapton and Bilsham. This will not be so likely to arise by limiting developments to those already approved, where applications are currently extant as listed at para. 1 above, or by utilising other sites **with definite boundaries**. We have already seen that these landowners with deep pockets will keep applying time and again, taking refusals to ever higher courts until they achieve success. It makes a mockery of democracy and localism and leaves residents feeling very angry, helpless and disengaged.
- 2.10. Both development sites and the area to the south are crossed by many public footpaths and the whole area provides an area of open countryside of great value and importance to residents of the increasingly urbanised areas of Felpham, Barnham and Yapton. This area is also a very important refuge for wildlife. Its eventual loss, by the process outlined above, will lead to all those residents taking to their cars to access areas of open countryside further afield. I would also point out that the loss to Yapton residents of the open countryside they currently enjoy at Ford due to a massive strategic development here and the likely loss of the value of the amenity and enjoyment of Binsted due to your Council's decision to support By-Pass Option 5A will make this even more likely, since who wants to walk round a housing estate or an area blighted by the sight and sound of a busy dual carriageway? For the reasons stated under 2.9 and 2.10 therefore, I would also suggest that the allocation of this area for a strategic housing development was a particularly poor choice.

For all these reasons I would strongly urge that these applications are refused.

Yours faithfully


Julie Robinson (Mrs)