



30 April 2018

Dear Neil and Karl,

Further to Landlink and Gleeson's presentation and ongoing discussions with Yapton Parish Council and ADC, I am formally writing to you on behalf of No YapTown with our additional feedback on SD7 improvements required around the proposed Strategic Housing Site SD7 – Bilsham Road and Drove Lane.

Infrastructure

Alongside YPC's concern at such a large housing proposal, No YapTown is also strongly of the view that the development proposals are not tenable, and would place a disproportionate ratio of Arun's development plans on one small, rural community and the environment – keeping in mind circa. 1000 additional houses are already going through the planning process.

We echo the YPC's concerns that before any proposal is even deliberated by ADC, it needs to have addressed and carried out further significant, *detailed* studies that addresses concerns around schools, roads, services such as doctors and traffic/public transport. This has all been well documented in YPC's response, and we second the points around infrastructure in this communication.

Adequate healthcare facilities **MUST** be accessible for people who do not drive/cycle or more importantly, are too ill to. Any enhancement of doctors therefore must factor in that the location should be on a **regular** bus route before anything is approved.

We support YPC's proposals around cycle paths, but also ask that any plan is only approved if it satisfactorily demonstrates how it will enhance footpaths for pedestrians and bridle paths for our riders in the community. This has emerged as a real concern amongst the diverse members that comprise No YapTown – many do not cycle or drive. The proposal also needs to address how it would work in partnership with local bus companies (eg part funding) to enhance access to

Barnham/Eastergate for those without a car or bike – *especially* if we are potentially facing having to travel for local services such as schools and doctors.

Environment

Evidence, not least of all from local water utilities indicate the existing Surface Water Hydrology and Infrastructure would struggle, this whole area has a very High Water Table and therefore SuDS designs can only manage a limited amount of controlled percolation, with the average weather events increasing this will become a long term problem. This also needs further detailed studies.

We have already provided evidence, working closely with several Sussex wildlife organisations that demonstrate the rich ecology of the land that is being considered for development – from slow worms, to swallows to bats – we are deeply concerned that developers to date have not satisfactorily answered how they would legally, safely and respectfully deal with the fact that a number of protected species are on the land. ‘We will move them’ is not an adequate response – where and how given the legal protection some of these species are awarded? Again, more detail is required before any decision is needed.

Community

The current amenities do not support increased footfall in the village. We therefore ask that any development plans must fully address how it would:

Help preserve the rural and historic aspect of the village by restoring the local canal and making a feature of it as somewhere to relax (café, picnic tables, seating, river trips similar to Chichester canal eg) but also making sure this also helps encourage local wildlife to continue to thrive.

Enhance the village hall. There are few business units to provide local goods and services to potentially double/treble the residents so we want to promote more ‘pop up’ businesses that could utilise the village hall such as the current weekly bakery/tea shop. This means – larger more agile space, state of the art catering facilities but also audio visual so social events/movie nights eg could be run *in a welcoming environment*.

Even with recent growth such as where the Lamb used to be located, we have already seen an impact on population growth in the village and crime/anti social behaviour. Drug taking, theft and the intimidation of locals has increased and you only have to fleetingly visit a bus shelter, or the village green to see signs of anti social or criminal behaviour. We’re deeply frustrated and tired of this and want any plans to have full reassurances that local policing can accommodate any growth to Yapton and protect law abiding citizens. Ditto – can Arun/WSCC support any increased costs that will be required for keeping the village safe eg CCTV, costs to

repair vandalism etc? It took an unacceptable amount of time to repair the vandalised bus shelter near Loveys Road eg.

Finally, we question whether the type of property being currently proposed actually meets the needs of either young families or the demographic of more mature couples or single households that the strategy is attempting to meet. We definitely question the maths around the need for 550 additional homes to be added to the current 1000 in the process and cannot understand this when latest data obtained under FOI indicated just 11 individuals or families were waiting for housing in Arun.

As said, we support the bulk of the information YPC has sent – so these are additional requirements/concerns/thoughts from your residents. We hope you will continue to work with us and consult fully with Yapton residents and not rush any decision-making. This is too critical, too irreversible. It deserves time, quality data and consultation. We repeat our request that local interest groups such as No YapTown are extended a welcome to the newly formed advisory groups so we can continue the dialogue and work together.

Best wishes

Helen

Helen Chown.

MCIPR, CIIC

On Behalf of No YapTown