

Steve Taylor
1, Park Cottages
North End Road
Yapton
Arundel
BN18 0DT

Your Ref: OWPC1687
Our Ref: Y/99/13/ 19-11-2013
Please ask for:
Mr C Cronin

2nd January 2014

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (as amended)

Outline application for 10.5 hectares of residential development (comprising up to 250 dwellings (30% to be affordable) together with ancillary open space and landscaping), 14.9 hectares of public open space development to be laid out as public parkland and landscaped green corridors, vehicular access from Ford Lane (The means of access) - This is a Departure from the Development Plan

Land to the North & East of St Marys Church Yapton

Thank you for your internet representation made on 26th December 2013 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

Dear Sir / Madame,

Please note that I strongly object to this application to build 250 houses on agricultural land (Y/99/13/).

- 1. The site fails to comply with the proposals of the local residents on development in our village, as expressed in the Yapton Neighbourhood Plan, which I understand is due to be published shortly. This proposal goes way beyond the proposed housing quota for Yapton, which is encompassed within the emerging local plan which does not include this site.*
- 2. The site ignores the evidence base of the 2009 SHLAA when considering site 98 (Orchard Business Park and environs). This said "- . The greenfield part of the site is not contained, given its close proximity to the Conservation Area just to the east and proximity to well used rights of way, is not considered suitable for development." (pg 310 2009 SHLAA Site ref 98).*
- 3. The site disregards the findings of Options for Growth 2009. This said that the village itself has a fairly limited range of facilities and the immediate vicinity is not an area of high housing need and offers limited availability to employment provision. Much of the surrounding landscape is relatively sensitive to change and there are areas of flood risk. In terms of the limited range of facilities and landscape constraints, the area was not considered suitable for major development, although small scale future provision to meet local needs was not ruled out.*
- 4. The site lies outside the clearly defined north eastern settlement boundary.*
- 5. The site is adjacent to the St Mary's conservation area and fails to enrich or enhance*

this designation. The site does not reflect the character and unique identity of the conservation area and is detrimental to its setting and relationship with the flood plain and South Down National Park.

- 6. The site is currently used as prime agricultural land which is highly productive and versatile producing both cereal and horticultural crops. With rising prices of food and transport, it is vital that such crops continue to be grown locally.*
- 7. The design is out of context with the key characteristics of the conservation area in terms of density, massing and ratio of unit to green space / gardens. It fails to enhance the locality but simply looks to replace two fields of highly productive crops with houses.*
- 8. The site has no existing vehicular access points onto North End Road or Ford Lane, both small rural B roads nearing over capacity, and with flow problems generated by the North End level crossing. Traffic volumes have increased enormously over the last 5 years, large lorries use these small roads, and there have recently been a number of accidents, one, well publicised incident involved seriously injury and the use of the Air Ambulance. More traffic and more access roads would only add to this. The traffic problems created twice a day by parking at the school would significantly increase.*
- 9. The 2012 SHLAA identifies sufficient land allocations within and outside settlement areas which are of lesser environmental value and / or brownfield land.*
- 10. The site falls within the designated SHLAA 2012 site 71 - Ford Eco-Town, but does not form a comprehensive development of the whole site. Both the 2012 SHLAA and recent agreed interim ADC Planning Policy confirm that site 71 must be treated as one comprehensive scheme in order to ensure adequate infrastructure benefits to enable the sustainability of the new settlement. Piecemeal development within this site will fail to be sustainable in terms of infrastructure, employment and community facilities for a new settlement.*
- 11. On a more personal note, this planning application would have a significant impact on my Wife and I as we live opposite the proposed development. Therefore I would ask that my objections to this application are fully considered and taken into account.*

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and will publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning & Economic Regeneration