

# Comment for planning application WSCC/052/20

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/052/20"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Harris"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="MURRELL GARDENS, 4, MURRELL GARDENS, BOGNOR REGIS, PO22 0DF"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>

## Comments

NO! 1. Placement and number of planning notices very poor for such a large disruptive prop. Ref: Non tech report - 2. Section 4. The "do nothing" option would be the preferred option by the vast majority of village residents yet when did we choose? It is not being adopted as it does not fit your agenda. There is not "real" congestion in the villages. Some traffic lights during peak times would certainly help to reduce any problem and also re-timing of railway signalling. This isn't the M25, Purley Cross or even Reigate one-way system in rush hour. Accidents? If you invite more traffic THAT will increase accidents. I presume this was just agreed by "stakeholders" and not those whose lives will be upended\*. 3. The proposal is simply a feeder road for 000's of houses and a money-making exercise (mmm all that council tax!) to fall in line with Agenda 21 (see UN website). 4. No consideration or respect for existing residents: An unacceptable number of properties will be adversely affected by this agenda-driven proposal. \*It has become obvious that the Council(s) are not in place to support the existing residents, just to satisfy superiors, obtain good appraisals, make money and help line the pockets of builders. This is NOT in the best interests of existing residents and the nonchalant approach and decision making shows they couldn't care less. I'd be surprised if any "stakeholders" are directly affected. 5. Lack of support and comms: One "virtual meeting" (ref 4.4.1 of non tech report) took place where there was no real discussion or opportunity to collectively agree the preferred wall option, just being told what options had been discarded. So called "experts" were unable to answer any questions on noise reduction, air pollution, flooding etc. Since then, everyone has conveniently hidden behind Covid and all questions raised have either not been answered or just been put off and told "it will be answered in the planning application". 6. Proposed layout: Plans are, unclear, technical & with no road names etc. The amount of space allocated for future residential development is obscene. You have already drowned Yapton, there's the eyesore on Fontwell Ave and the "Dual carriageway living" of the Shopwyke site down the road. Arun DC website states that there are more than 700,000 empty properties in the UK, why not acquire/utilise those? The "Flyby" video shows the road trying to work in harmony with the landscape. It fails to show a close view of the "wall" and the view that residents of Murrell, Chantry etc. are expected to put up with. It also doesn't show the closeness of the road to the said properties. How high will the actual road be? How far from the back gardens will the wall be? 7. Pollution and damage: Pollution during the build will be unacceptable. I can't believe the report states just a small amount of increase in particulate matter and that it will only last up to a year. Wow, thanks! Reduction in air quality will be negligible and temporary? Doubt it. I assume your modelling software is similar to that used by the Government to model Covid deaths? 8. Pollution after the build will be unacceptable. Amounts of noise/air pollution as the increased traffic heads down the new road with no cameras present (ref: WSCC virtual meeting). The question of decibel reduction the wall would provide, could not be answered by the noise 'expert' and was unable to answer whether the wall would be built before they begin tearing up the land! 9. Big impact to wildlife. The 'consultations' last year (the consultations at village halls where comments collated were never reported back and largely ignored) stated that wildlife was minimal. NOT correct. The survey failed to document the many rabbits, deer and cats often enjoying the site. If any do survive will there be any safety measures implemented during the build to ensure they can get out of any holes dug? 3.4.1 How can you replace a foraging area when the foraging animals will probably not be around anymore after the build? "Minor" disturbance on habitats is stated in the report? You are planning to destroy the area and having not considered all the species present, there will be far more disruption than your modelling says. Creating a wildlife corridor is fine but any animals that are still alive have a road to contend with, good luck. 10. Flood Risk: The field behind Murrell/Chantry etc is prone to flooding as are the back gardens, are we led to believe that a drainage pond somewhere at the top of the 'site' will prevent this or will increased excess water purely run straight down (there is a slight downward gradient I believe). Drainage people in the field in recent times, was work done to ensure a glowing drainage report for this planning application? Your report states, minor or negligible risk, really? 11. Cost/Financial: In a time of economic crisis, job losses, underpaid nurses, a major care crisis and green issues, here are "authorities" blowing millions on as "road to new town". Spend money on repairing the drain holes on Barnham Road or getting rid of increasing litter on Fontwell Avenue. What % of council tax is being used for this? The effects of all types of pollution, visual impact, property value/desirability, loss of privacy and security cannot be compensated but it must be offered/pursued. 12. I don't really know how/if these comments will be read/taken into account/acted on based on communication quality so far. Is this now just a formality and adherence to procedure? who will be responsible for approving the proposal, someone from the planning team or a completely independent panel?? Do we sit back and wait for "New Crawley" to emerge from the mess and pollution? 13. To summarise: A STRONG

OBJECTION but sense it will fall on deaf ears. 14. I'll leave you with this: My 84yr old Dad's response to the "flyby" video was; "It looks like they are trying to put glitter on a turd!" All at #4

Received

18/11/2020 16:22:46

Attachments