

From: [Carl Monk](#)
To: [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: WSCC/052/20 - Objection
Date: 12 December 2020 12:55:24
Attachments: [A29 Objections.pdf](#)

Mr Sieralowski,

Please find attached our objections to the A29 Realignment (Phase 1). We would be grateful if you could confirm it has been received and included.

Kind regards

Carl Monk

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

12th December 2020

OBJECTION to Planning Application WSCC/052/20 – A29 Realignment (Phase 1)

We wish to register our objection to the above-mentioned planning application on the following grounds.

Lack of Public Engagement

Considering the consultation for the project in Feb 2019 was widely advertised in the BEW area with a leaflet drop, this application appears to have had minimal publicity. Only those properties that are directly adjacent to the development area seem to have been formally notified, with the bare minimum of notices placed on the ends of the footpaths this impacts. It is only due to actions by local residents who have posted additional, more prominent notices, and via social media that the wider community is even aware of this. Notification should have been made to the same residents that were canvassed for the consultation as this does more than impact a handful of residents bordering the land.

Inaccurate Project Statement – It is stated that this will improve journey times. However, by WSCC's own calculations this whole project will only see an improvement of 1 minute on average from Fontwell to Bognor. This is not a good use of tax payers money. We would also argue that the traffic statistics it is based on is now invalid as there has been a real and permanent shift in working practices since the Covid19 pandemic.

Incomplete Project – The whole of this road should be brought for planning in its entirety. With a Phased approach, there is a real risk that the whole project will not be delivered, leaving Phase 1 as a "road to nowhere" that was built just to service 400 houses. Given the current Covid/Brexit world we live in Phase 2 stands a good chance of being shelved for the foreseeable if developers do not have the money/market to build houses.

Proximity to Murrell Gardens, Chantry Mead & Ewens Gardens

The proposed road will be no more than 20m from a number of properties, including our own. This is unacceptable. The Barnham Road (B2233) is currently 100m from our property, with the closest neighbour being 70m away. This presents several issues:

Air Pollution

A report by King's College London (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-50467700>) suggests "Children exposed to roadside air pollution could have their lung growth stunted by up to 14%" and "Living within 50m of a major road could increase the risk of lung cancer by up to 10%", which we will be well inside. A global study in the Lancet (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-47882038>) suggests around 13% of childhood asthma diagnoses worldwide are due to traffic pollution. As parents to a 5 and 10 year old, this is troubling, as it will be for other young families living alongside this section of the proposed road.

Light Pollution

The design documents show 10m high streetlighting along the West (Halo) side of the road. Even with a 3m acoustic barrier, this will be shining light directly into the rear of properties that are bordering this road. In our specific case these are the bedrooms at the rear of our property. While

we do not have perfect dark skies at the moment, there is currently little light pollution. The Fordingbridge Estate (Halo) produces minimal light as their raised halogen lighting is directed North/West and causes us little issues.

Noise Pollution

Save for a few large or loud vehicles we currently enjoy minimal traffic noise. At night the foxes generate the most noise! Despite the proposed "acoustic barrier", the road noise will be significantly increased. This is shown in the Environmental Statement (Section 7) with a predicted 10dB increase in noise levels. This is unacceptable, especially with bedrooms at the rear of the property, including in the roof space where the insulation provides less acoustic protection than brick walls.

Loss of Privacy

Currently the properties along the Eastern border are provided with good shielding from the Fordingbridge estate (Halo) by an earth bund, drainage ditch and well-established trees. Even in these winter months the trees provide a reasonable coverage. This was established in 1992 by applications EG/21/92 and EG/38/92, which clearly state this was constructed "In the interests of the visual amenities of the locality". The planning shows this will be removed and replaced by the road

The replacement measures (such as we can find in the documentation) amount to a 3m wall and some shrubs. This will do little to shield our properties from the Fordingbridge site and allow road and site uses views into first, and in some cases second, floor windows.

We would request that WSCC explain why they are unable to purchase part of the Eastern side of the Fordingbridge site and move the line of the road to further West so as to retain the bund. This, in conjunction with acoustic fencing, would leave a well-established and far more palatable screening than is currently being offered. The satellite buildings currently there could be relocated to additional land to the North of the current Fordingbridge site. Thus Halo, and any other businesses on site, would be able to continue in the long term.

Compromised Security

It is also unclear how the remaining land between our properties and the road will be secured. Currently most/all properties from Murrell Gardens along to Ewens Gardens have a 1.2m fence. For a significant proportion of residents this is post and rail rather than closed board. Under the current land use this is not an issue as access to the area by the general public is difficult at best. The plans do not seem to show any fencing, or similar, at either the Barnham Road end, or the attenuation pond at the Ewens Gardens end of the field. In fact, the plans show footpaths either side of the attenuation pond which would suggest this is intended to be accessed by pedestrians.

Wildlife

We are concerned that the ecology survey is out of date as in the last year there has been sightings of deer in the Western section of the land. This road is likely to destroy the habitat for the deer, which roam from the South of the land, all the way down to the Barnham Road.



May 2020 – next to our property



Oct 2020 – Up the field towards Ewens Gardens

There is also concern over the loss of habitat by the removal of the bund for the resident rabbits and foxes that live in this area. During the summer months the bats are also frequent visitors to our gardens spending hours hunting in the evenings.

Flooding

This area is prone to flooding, and we are concerned that this will not be effectively mitigated. In the last three years there has been standing water every winter after a prolonged period of rain, or from snow melt. We enclose pictures taken of the land between our property and Halo as dated.



8th March 2018 – Post snow melt



3rd March 2020 – most recent flooding

As recently build properties, all our rain runoff is stored in SUDS in the gardens. The SUDS are along the border of this field. During the wetter months our own lawns are sodden to the point that standing on it will result in water rising to the surface. This is all without the additional run off from a new road. The general fall of the land is from the field into Murrell Gardens/Chantry Mead. Should this land flood due to the reduced water retention this will end up in our gardens and our properties. Flooding was of major concern when Murrell Gardens was put before planning and was one of the key reasons it was rejected twice (EG/4/10/ & EG/63/10/) before finally being approved with a number of conditions relating to drainage matters (EG/54/11/DOC).

This information, along with images, has been previously shared via email with Elaine Martin (WSCC Project Manager) in Feb 2019. We have also spoken with the various surveyors that have visited the field regarding this. At this point it does not appear to have been taken into account.

Potential Loss of Light

The proposed landscaping is unclear. The key on the drawings suggests “woodland edge” but we have yet to find what this means. If trees are to be planted then this will cause us to have obstructed afternoon/evening sunlight, thus leaving the rear of our property in permanent shade.

Environmental Statement 2.2.4 – “Site is not currently used for agricultural purposes”

We would argue that this is factually incorrect. In 2017 and 2018 the land adjacent to Murrell Gardens, and to the North of Halo was used to graze sheep between January and March. It has also been cut and baled at least once each summer. Agricultural use of the area has only diminished due to the ongoing surveying and testing over the past two years. This results in misleading information about the usefulness of this land.

Changing of the Halo Entrance

This will further add to the increase in noise and light pollution as entering and exiting will be in direct line with our properties. This should stay on the Barnham Road to avoid causing additional issues or be off the roundabout as a 5th arm.

Conclusion

In conclusion we strongly object to these plans in their current form. We request that the planning committee direct WSCC

- to move the line of the road further West to retain the established bund and reduce the noise/light/air pollution impact on residents. This will require the purchasing of land within the footprint of the Halo site, and/or reallocating some of the land to the North/West.
- take into consideration the presence of standing water as shown
- outline how the residents of the affected properties will be kept secure
- review the ecology in respect to the deer population that is not documented

We would also like to highlight that this route has been part of the Arun local plan since at least 2011 (in earlier drafts of the plans the map used did not have Chantry Mead or Murrell Gardens shown). This would strongly suggest it has been known to WSCC Strategic Planners since before this time. Despite that, these developments were approved without issue. In all likelihood this was done in the full knowledge that this route will impact these properties in the near future. To that end WSCC should have either objected to the developments we now live in at the time or now change the route to accommodate the area as it is presently.

Your sincerely

Carl and Catherine Monk