

Copy

Tall Trees,
Church Road,
Yapton,
Arundel,
West Sussex BN18 0EJ

Mr. C. Cronin,
Planning Department,
Arun District Council Civic Centre,
Maltravers Street,
Littlehampton BN17 5LF

3rd January 2014

Dear Mr. Cronin,

Proposed housing estate of 250 units adjoining St Mary's Church, Yapton

Application number Y/99/13

We object in the strongest possible terms to this proposal, which would destroy our village. There are many reasons but in this letter we will list only the following:

1. There is no apparent need or demand for more housing in Yapton. There is certainly no current or anticipated need for 250 houses, as is confirmed by Arun District Council's proposal for 100 homes in 20 years for the emerging Local Plan.
2. The proposal would create a kind of ghetto to the north of the village, being outside the natural boundary.
3. As there are essentially no new jobs in Yapton, the result would be a dormitory for Chichester, Brighton or Portsmouth, with yet more traffic on West Sussex's roads. Why not focus development on where there is at least some work available and / or better transport links?
4. To allow the proposal to proceed drives a cart and horses through the democratic planning process laid down by the National Planning Policy Framework and all the good work done by Arun DC and by the Yapton Neighbourhood Planning Group. The developer has bypassed the latter entirely until very recently and has not conducted a proper consultation with the village, merely a token. The Neighbourhood Planning Group has a fully fledged plan which has been widely publicized and discussed in Yapton, but cannot be formally adopted because, I understand, this is impossible until Arun D.C. has formally adopted its own plan. And the Neighbourhood Plan has been very carefully put together with local landowners to so as to preserve the village, choosing discreet locations where modest developments can be carried out in a manner calculated to preserve the character of the village.

5. The proposed development will greatly increase the flow of traffic, which is already highly congested in the area of the school – to the point that a significant hazard already exists. The level crossing already involves unacceptable delays. Queuing well over ten minutes is frequently experienced. The proposed exit into Ford Lane would be highly problematic, given the narrow and twisting state of this unclassified lane.

6. The proposed housing estate would increase the population of Yapton at a stroke by close to 20%, on top of the increase resulting from the two hundred or so houses already approved. The impact on the already stretched infrastructure would be unacceptable. We cannot imagine that a development on this scale could provide sufficient funds to overcome this problem, and we have been told that, both in the 2012 SHLAA and recently agreed Arun District Planning Policy it was accepted that land forming part of the previous proposals for the Ford Eco Town could not be developed piecemeal, since it would not be sustainable in terms of infrastructure, employment and community facilities. The proposal site is of course part of the Ford Eco Town proposal, and piecemeal development permitted today would be used as a precedent for the next piecemeal proposal, throwing away the lessons from the Eco Town experience and replicating the faceless development that covers the coastal strip from Littlehampton eastwards.

7. The proposed development would never form an integral part of the village, lying as it would beyond the natural boundary of the village formed by Church Lane. The 2009 SHLAA considered greenfield land to the East of Orchard Business Park (which adjoins the eastern flank of the proposed development area) and concluded “...Given its proximity to the Conservation area.....and its proximity to well used rights of way, is not considered suitable for development.” The proposed development site is even closer to the Church and Conservation Area and rights of way and therefore even less suitable for development.

8. The rights of way across the open swathe of the proposed development site are widely used and appreciated by Yaptonians and ramblers. Were the development to go ahead, the rights of way would lose most of their amenity, becoming little more than concrete pathways through a built-up estate. The views of the South Downs National Park, the Cathedral and Castle would be gone forever.

9. The proposed housing estate would adjoin the Grade 1 listed Mediaeval church of St Mary's, the four grade 2 listed houses in Church Lane and the Conservation Area, and, so far from conserving and enhancing heritage assets as the Council is required to do, it would severely impact them and spoil the beautiful views across the floodplain to the Southdowns National Park, the Cathedral and Castle.

10. It is outrageous that the developer should want to use grade 1 agricultural land to build a housing estate at a time when the country imports 40% of its food. This is the last type of land to use, and our Neighbourhood Plan is based on smaller, more appropriate developments on land of lower categories, which can be assimilated naturally into our Village.

11. We are told that Arun District Council's Options for Growth concluded “The

village itself has a fairly limited range of facilities and the immediate vicinity is not an area of high housing need and offers little availability of employment provision. Much of the surrounding landscape is relatively sensitive to change and there are areas of flood risk.....The area was not considered suitable for major development....."

Nothing has changed beyond the fact that some 200 more houses are already approved and in the pipeline; and the Council should stand by its past conclusions.

Yours sincerely,

Philip and Mary Kinnersly



Mr P Kinnersly
Toll Trees
Church Road
Yapton
ARUNDEL
BN18 0EJ



5th February 2014

Dear Mr. Cronin.

App: Y/99/13

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
TECHNICAL SUPPORT

- 5 FEB 2014

ACTION...

My husband and I note with considerable concern that our letter of objection regarding the above a dated 3 January, does not appear in the list of correspondence on the Arun DC website.

I therefore enclose a copy letter a would be most grateful if this could be put on the website.

Also, I know that Vicky Newman has written on behalf of the Group of us who are strongly opposed to this development and currently I

- 2 -

cannot see this letter.

Many thanks.

