

## Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 - Consultation Responses.

**Map/Para/Policy:** 4.77

Map/Para/Policy: 4.77

Reference No. 724

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This is an ideal opportunity to insist on high quality flood-resistant dwellings. "On-site mitigation measures" may not go far enough. A radical site-wide design solution would be preferable, based on experience elsewhere e.g. Holland and the enclosed illustration (see hard copy of rep) is in fact Dutch. Some high rise need not be ruled out if it is attractively designed, as it is raised above any flood, but cheap and potentially ugly slabs would not be a good solution. Water features to drain and even wind-pumps could be an attractive addition to the landscape. This could be an exciting, world-class design if the right architects/engineers become involved and the Local Plan should make it quite clear that this is what is wanted.

---

**Map/Para/Policy:** All

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 975

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation New Monks Farm Development Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Enplan UK Ltd

All references to Green Gaps within the Draft Local Plan

We object to all references to the Local Green Gap within the draft Local Plan as follows:

1. Objectives 6 & 7 on page 16
  2. RD Policy 2 Spatial Strategy and the reference to compromising the Local Green Gap.
  3. Para 2.22 and the reference to having a severe impact on Local Green Gaps.
  4. Object to para 3.43 and references to Local Green Gaps.
  5. Object to para 3.46 and in particular to 'a key challenge for this Local Plan is to balance the need for development against the need to minimise the impact on the countryside and landscape character, particularly in these gaps'. This is confusing as to the function and need for a Green Gap.
  6. Object to para 3.48
  7. Object to 3.49 and 3.50 which appears to support development within the Green Gap at the airport.
  8. Object to 4.58.
  9. Object to para 4.93.
-

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 889

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Academy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I'm writing on behalf of the Shoreham Academy and would be obliged if you accept the following representation:

"The governors of Shoreham Academy support the aspects of the local plan which help regenerate the economy and create a wide range of new jobs and aspiration for the residents. It is important that infrastructure is provided before or as soon as developments come on stream. Road, sustainable transport and flood defence improvements are key enablers to future employment and housing sites.

In context of infrastructure, the Academy intends to run to full capacity, 1650 places, as demand increases, but would not support being asked to provide more space than the design allows. We are already over subscribed for the current teaching capacity and local demographics suggest strong increase for school places at all levels."

---

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 516

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object very strongly to any houses being built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: All Reference No. 864

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

I have no idea which Map/Paragraph/Policy number my comments below refer to. My comments are a heartfelt and overall observation. The A27 and A259 are so often congested with traffic through from Shoreham to Arundel, particularly in the summer months that more housing in this area will greatly add to this major infrastructure problem. Additional population and car use into the area would be a considerable drain on all the emergency services and probably local schools. Regeneration to Lancing is urgently needed, along the lines of Shoreham and updating public transport and roads, before Adur Council should consider more housing being built. Unless the plan includes the house building contractors to provide these before commencing additional houses on such a large scale.

Map/Para/Policy: All Reference No. 971

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation Mid Sussex District Council

Agent's Organisation

Mid Sussex District Council is grateful for the opportunity to comment on Adur's Revised Draft Local Plan. We are pleased to note the ongoing positive engagement on 'duty to co-operate' issues by Sussex authorities in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Mid Sussex also recognises the difficult decisions that Adur District Council faces in identifying potential development sites to meet its housing needs. The Revised Draft Local Plan proposes a minimum of 2797-2947 dwellings (140-147 dwellings per year) within Adur over the plan period. This compares to a lower Option A of 2835 dwellings (142 dwellings per year) and a higher Option B of 3685 dwellings (184 dwellings per year) in the earlier Draft Local Plan 2012. As previously stated in our response to the Draft Adur Local Plan 2012, whilst Mid Sussex District Council sympathises with the environmental constraints in Adur district as the situation is similar for Mid Sussex, it is concerned that Adur District Council is not planning to meet its housing needs. The proposal for 140-147 homes per annum will place additional pressures on other authorities to accommodate these unmet housing needs and it is not clear how the authority plans to deal with unmet need identified within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Locally Generated Housing Needs Study. We note that the Sussex Coast Housing Market Area study stated that delivery of 180-200 dwellings per year might be achievable in Adur. We also note from paragraph 2.30 of the draft Plan that it is intended to undertake further work on capacity. We would encourage you to undertake this work diligently with the aim of meeting your housing needs within Adur district. Mid Sussex District Council has prepared a District Plan which meets its own objectively assessed housing needs, and additionally makes a contribution towards the unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. Evidence that the District Council has used to prepare the Plan shows that the options for development are constrained both by environmental and infrastructure capacity. Therefore, Mid Sussex is unlikely to be able to accommodate any further additional growth generated by the unmet need from other authorities.

The District Council remains firmly committed to continuing its joint working with Adur and other adjoining Local Planning Authorities to address issues of mutual interest in a positive way. I would be grateful if you would keep us informed of progress with the Adur Local Plan.

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 505

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Marine Management Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The MMO has reviewed the document and would suggest that reference be included to the Marine and Coastal Access Act (2009), Marine Policy Statement, Marine Plans and Marine Licensing, in order to ensure that all relevant regulation is covered. The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 created the Marine Management Organisation with cross-party support, with the aim of delivering the UK government's vision for clean, healthy, safe, productive and biologically diverse oceans and seas. The Marine and Coastal Access Act can be found on line at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2009/23/contents>

As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring mark there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. In our duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure compatibility with existing development plans, which apply down to the low water mark, we are seeking to identify the 'marine relevance' of applicable plan policies. The MMO began planning for the East area in April 2011. The next round of planning, in the South plan area, began in 2013. The South plan area runs from Folkestone to the River Dart and therefore includes the Adur and Worthing district. The MMO will be working with all Local Authorities in the plan area and until such time as a marine plan is in place we advise Local Authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. The Marine Policy Statement will also guide the development of Marine Plans across the UK. More information can be found at <http://www.defra.gov.uk/news/2011/03/18/marine-policy-statement/>

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 514

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Make sure water supplies are plentyfull.

Ensure that traffic speeds are sensible.

Add enough street lighting to make it safe for people to walk about.

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

### Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013

In principal the Forum considers there is much to like in the Draft Plan, as regards access, green infrastructure and improvements to facilities for walkers and cyclists. However, Members would like to see equestrian needs recognised (where appropriate), and reference made to the West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan ([www.westsussex.gov.uk/rowip](http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/rowip)). We would like to see the importance of the public rights of way (PRoW) network and access routes to local communities, providing safe amenity and leisure routes and contributing to health, tourism and sustainability given more emphasis. As part of Green Infrastructure, PRoWs also provide 'green corridors' which are of benefit to the natural environment and wildlife. The Coastal Plain is sadly lacking in a comprehensive network of multi-use PRoW.

The Forum's general position on various issues relating to access and PRoWs within and around new development is set out below:

1. A new housing estate should not be designed in isolation and must not become a barrier to countryside access for residents - rather it should provide a 'gateway' from the urban area into the wider countryside.
  2. New development can provide a unique opportunity to solve present problems and provide missing links in the network of PRoWs which are the principal means to access the countryside. This will enhance the ability of local people, both existing and new residents, to enjoy access to the countryside.
  3. The PRoW network is part of our heritage - many paths are historic routes closely connected to the history of the local community. Wherever possible, a new housing estate should retain PRoWs on their existing line; they should be seen as part of a wider network. Sometimes, they will be alongside or contained between hedges and trees - this rural character should be retained as it will give the path a visual and wildlife link to the farmland and woodlands beyond. In the past, new housing estates have sometimes resulted in the urbanisation of PRoWs, and the loss of their rural characteristics which can diminish their value to residents.
  4. PRoWs should be linked with other open spaces and green corridors within the development, as well as to the wider countryside network. A new housing estate will inevitably place greater pressure on the wider path network with the increased demand for access. Some path surfaces will need to be improved and it may be desirable, for example, to upgrade a footpath to bridleway status so that it can provide a safe off-road link for all users.
  5. Many minor roads are used as links in the PRoW network, any increase in the volume and speed of vehicles using these roads, as a result of new development, makes them unsafe for vulnerable users (walkers, cyclists, equestrians), and fragments the PRoW network. In such circumstances, consideration should be given to the creation of new off-road routes, or the upgrading of existing PRoW to provide safe traffic-free routes for all users.
-

Map/Para/Policy: All  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 826  
Organisation UK Independence Party  
Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

#### Position Statement from UK Independence Party Councillors Representing Adur Residents

Adur is nearly full.

Adur is no longer able to support net immigration from within the UK no different than the UK is able to support the on-going immigration from the EU Nations and elsewhere.

In the past, Adur has expanded through natural population growth and net immigration. In recent years the natural population growth has stabilised while immigration has continued. We are now nearly full.

The present draft of the Adur Plan envisages a minimum of about 3,000 new houses in Adur over the next 20 years. When we come to look at the amount of brownfield land available we see that less than 2,000 dwellings can be accommodated. There is significant opposition from Sompting and Lancing to new construction in their parishes, particularly on the proposed green-field land. As a party, UKIP takes local democracy very seriously and we are sensitive to the voices of those who are most affected by Adur District Council's decisions. This is the true spirit of 'Localism'. There are only modest prospect for industrial development in Adur. Outside of Shoreham Harbour and the Airport there are few sites available for further expansion.

We believe that house building should reflect the needs and wishes of the local residents. We would therefore recommend a policy of approving the construction of new dwellings initially on brownfield sites. The number built should reflect local natural population growth.

#### Infrastructure

Our infrastructure is creaking. Traffic congestion endemic. We simply cannot take any more cars. More houses mean more people and therefore more cars. 'Sustainable Transport' initiatives are all very welcome but only have a modest effect. There is no money and no initiative to remedy the problem. It is not logical to contemplate accommodating more people unless there is an improvement in infrastructure, roads, sewers, water and energy supplies.

#### The Sussex Coast Urban Sprawl

Lancing and Sompting are under threat of losing their identity by having their green gaps eroded. This is not what 'Sustainable Communities' is all about.

#### Phasing New Developments

It makes sense that new developments should take advantage of brownfield sites before greenfield sites. We would like to see this enshrined in The Plan. We would also like to see new developments phased according to known levels of local need.

#### The Macro-Economic Outlook

The macro-economic policy of the Coalition Government is that of (quantative easing) running money off the Bank of England's photocopiers and shovelling it into the economy. We are back to 'boom and bust'. When developers see cheap money and rising house prices they will be naturally inclined to apply pressure to construct more profitable larger 'greenfield' housing developments. The Coalition Government will wish to give the

illusion of economic growth by supporting larger building projects i.e. larger, 'greenfield' housing developments.

We suggest a more robust assessment of Adur Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment process to include all sites where a dwelling could be built not just sites that can accommodate 6 or more dwellings. Consideration should be given to ADC owned car garage sites that may be available for development, housing people is more important than housing cars. Consideration should also be given to installing lofts in Adur Homes properties creating extra bedroom space where it is feasible.

When the housing bubble bursts, many will be caught once again in the 'negative equity trap'. Those with houses in areas where mass house building has taken place will be the worst affected. As house prices fall due to the collapsing economy (the bust following the boom) we will be left with houses that cannot be sold at any price, or, worse still, bankrupt developers and half-built housing estates.

We are therefore very concerned that the proposed developments in Sompting and Lancing would take place before all brownfield alternatives have been exhausted. We therefore urge Adur District Council to consider 'greenfield' developments as a last resort – and say so in The Plan. We would also wish to see new-builds phased in with natural local population growth.

#### Labour Force

We note from the Locally Generated Housing Needs Study that nearly half of the working population in Adur commutes daily out of Adur for work. Adur – like most areas of the country – does not have 100% employment. We would therefore commend an economic growth strategy based on utilising the talents of the half of the workforce that currently leave Adur each morning. Additionally, we should be looking to capitalise on the talents of the currently unemployed workers in our community. We do not believe that there is a need to create economic regeneration by importing more people.

#### Bullet Points

- House building in the next 20 years should be limited to the capacity of existing brownfield sites i.e. 2,000 dwellings and a maximum of 500 houses on green-field sites.
- Expansion of the housing stock by building on green-field sites should happen after all brownfield sites have been exhausted.
- No development on flood plain.
- Expansion of the housing stock should be slightly ahead of local demand i.e. no mass construction of housing estates in the early years.
- Provision should be made for natural expansion of the population in Adur and a policy of no net immigration adopted.
- If there is a perceived shortfall in local labour which affects growth in the local economy, then expansion in the economy should be such as to draw on residents who currently work outside of Adur. Additionally, growth should be targeted to taking advantage of the talents of the local unemployed.
- Shoreham Harbour housing development should focus initially on clearing the backlog requirement for social housing and low cost housing.
- Any expansion of the housing stock should not contribute to further degradation in the infrastructure. Infrastructure must be upgraded in parallel with incremental housing development.

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 705

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1.3 - Will the local plan be adopted before documents are produced on affordable housing and green initiatives?

1.10 - Will the equalities 'report take into account the need for bungalows and residential homes for the elderly? More flats for the elderly will lead to more mental health issues as they are very isolating.

V5 p.16 - How will you make Shoreham 'more' pleasant, with an increase in traffic and higher pollution levels. At the local meetings I have attended, no one has given hard facts on the present levels of air pollution in spite of it being a major concern. Much more detail is needed about the 'new' opportunities for development, as yet another charity shop opens.

V6 - Morrisons is too big and too tall; and in that respect it does not offer a high level of design.

V10 - How 'green' will the buildings be? Will they be required to have solar panels as the South facing bank of the harbour is an ideal spot.

3.33 - Access problems at the rail crossing by the Dolphin road estate - this MUST be improved, not 'if the opportunity arises'. The crossing is dangerous.

Do you actually know how much more accommodation for school places will be needed? And where?

Has land been set aside for a new primary school and doctor's surgery?

What are the specifics to relieve road access and traffic congestion on the Brighton road?

There should be answers to these questions before any plan is approved.

---

Map/Para/Policy: All

Reference No. 26

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am seriously concerned regarding the plan in general because the area in question does not have the transport infrastructure to cope at present without a significant increase that this plan would cause. Equally important is the lack of schools, shops, health centre services and community space currently available. These services would therefore be insufficient to cope with the increase to the local community that such a plan as proposed would create.

Sompting has always maintained its' rural appeal and this would be totally lost with such a massive building programme. Whilst I am aware that there are a lack of affordable housing the UK generally, to propose such a plan in an area with saturated resources is nothing short of madness. The adverse effect on the area would far outweigh any benefits to the local economy.

PLEASE RECONSIDER

---

Map/Para/Policy: All  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 1167  
Organisation Lancing Parish Council  
Agent's Organisation

See extract of minutes below:

#### S4. Draft Adur Local Plan

ADC had released the revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 for consultation purposes, which was to end on the 7th November 2013.

In view of the importance of this matter to Lancing and as the next scheduled Full Council meeting would fall outside the consultation window, this special meeting had been convened to construct Council's formal response as part of the planning consultation process into the Draft Local Plan as proposed by ADC.

The Chair gave an opening statement and reminded the meeting that the Local Plan was an important document and that every local planning authority in England was required to have a clear, up to date Local Plan, which conformed to the National Planning Policy Framework, met local development needs, and reflected local people's views of how they wished their community to develop

He continued by saying that it went without saying that some local residents would not welcome some or all of the proposals but that this should be balanced with the overall benefits that a sound Local Plan could provide.  
The Chair referred to the Local plan as a set of rules for how Lancing would develop over time and, as planning decisions must normally be taken in accordance with the local plan, if the plan was not credible then developers would have the right to challenge the plan which could lead to adhoc developments bearing little or no resemblance as to how the community wanted Lancing to develop.

For these reasons he explained that the Council might support the principles outlined in Draft Local Plan but qualify this by asking ADC to give strong consideration to certain matters, which had come to light at the meeting.

The Chair asked Councillors if they wished to respond to any matters they had heard during the evening.

Cllr James Butcher was the first to speak and agreed that without a local plan developers could railroad development through and referred to issues that Arun DC had experienced in trying to control development in their area and the number of planning appeals that they were now dealing with.

However, he made the point that the Council should not only be considering the planning implications of the plan but should take into account the human considerations and the effect on the residents if the Draft Plan is accepted in its current format.

He questioned the need for more business space and spoke of the current effects on local businesses that the poor transport system was having. He also referred to the danger that providing more business premises in one area might impact on other areas. The scenario might be that business opportunities would not necessarily improve but merely relocate and possibly away from the village centre to the detriment of the Village community and thus be at variance with the ideals of the adopted Lancing Vision.

Cllr Butcher also expressed serious concerns about the on-going flooding situation in New Monks Farm, which he argued was evident even during

times of light rainfall and he was not convinced that the relevant authorities were fully appreciative of the causes of the flooding and therefore could not effect the necessary cures.

Cllr Leslie Sampson, who had lived in Lancing for many years and knew the area well, considered the area totally inappropriate for development as the land had always flooded and that he could not understand why ADC was not looking northwards for other sites more suitable for development.

Cllr Mary Hamblin was concerned by the possible dispersion of water to other areas if development was permitted on the flood plain. These effects could expose other areas to severe flooding which must be avoided.

Cllr Liz Haywood was against the proposals and reminded Council of the plight of local residents who had long suffered from the flooding and lived with the constant congestion and safety issues caused by the over capacity of the A27. She was of the opinion that the Plan offered little or no solutions to these problems and could even exacerbate matters.

Cllr Sid Hilsum was also against the proposals and questioned the very need for such an advanced plan. He questioned the accuracy of predictions for 2030 and was of the opinion that the whole matter was a 'numbers game'. Cllr Hilsum argued that now that West Beach had been excluded from the plan, the shortfall in housing provision was to be made up by developing New Monks Farm.

Overall he was not convinced of the authenticity of any of the figures presented and referred to the plan as 'a nonsense'.

Cllr Jean Turner made the point that, as the area had an ageing population, then properties would naturally come back onto the housing market when people died. She had found no mention or reference to this matter in the Plan and questioned whether this oversight might likely reduce the housing needs figures as presented in the documents.

Having given councillors an opportunity to voice their opinions the Chair called a vote on whether the Council wished to endorse the Local Plan in its present form.

After a vote of 9 for, none against and one abstention, Council RESOLVED that it could not support or endorse the Local Plan in its present draft.

Council hoped that ADC Officers would give strong consideration to the matters raised at the meeting, especially those in connection with New Monks Farm, in revising the draft, which it looked forward to receiving in due course.

Map/Para/Policy: All  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 776  
Organisation  
Agent's Organisation

I object to the proposed plan as being environmentally damaging, adding more traffic to an already congested road system, adding more patients to an already very busy medical centre. The need to provide more school places (the proposal to create plans outside the immediate area) will only add to the traffic problem as parts drive their children to school. More rubbish requiring disposal in landfill site...More pressure on water supplies, we were threatened with rationing last year.

---

Map/Para/Policy: All  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 88  
Organisation  
Agent's Organisation

No more buildings on our flood plain  
The flood plain protects our homes  
Any more buildings and we will flood

---

Map/Para/Policy: All  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 43  
Organisation  
Agent's Organisation

The plan does not adequately consider: -  
Impact on traffic congestion which is already a problem on the A27.  
Increase in aircraft movements and danger of crashing into housing.  
The flooding problem particular if sea levels rise as forecast.  
The lack of parking in Lancing.  
The lack of facilities for children in the area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: All Reference No. 46  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Most, apart from the chattering class, are justifiably horrified at house building on such a huge scale locally. Maybe the 'Government' wants this area to end up like Bradford...

Whilst we admire Tim Loughton's efforts to stop the proposed further destruction of our local countryside and flood plains, sadly he is one/the voice in a growing sea of crackpots - crackpots who have flooded our already overcrowded UK (1/3 most crowded island on our earth?) with ever more immigrants. Could these politicians be trusted to run even car boot sales with integrity - but how can they restore sight to the blind in the short term - when they do we'll want to leave a ruined UK.

Map/Para/Policy: All Reference No. 778  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

The general outline of the local plan causes me concern, are we not already at capacity?

You are looking at building on what land is left in the district without the facilities of extra employment potential, improved transport, roads or leisure. The problem is compounded by new housing development does not provide adequate leisure space.

Why not advise the government that extra capacity cannot proceed without the A27 Worthing bypass?

As an example, you identify the need for increased leisure facilities but no space is left and you are unable to give specific sites for such expansion.

Proposals for new housing on Shoreham Beach are now being refused since the area is at capacity. Other congestion problems will start to appear as currently approved plans come on stream. Other ideas are coming forward that are not mentioned in the plan, the Adur Civic Centre car park as an example.

Regarding the Western arm of Shoreham Harbour, I use many of the facilities in that region, where can they move to? Other activities rely on boat deliveries; do they have to leave the district?

Map/Para/Policy: All Reference No. 3  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

For what it is worth my only comments on the Draft Local Plan is that there seems little or no point in spending time trying to make constructive comments. As we saw from the Brighton and Hove Albion Football planning application, any valid objections are simply ignored. Where there are genuine and reasonable objections raised it seems that various departments within Adur are quite happy to agree reports that they know are inaccurate and false and even submit information that they know is false in order to try and justify their decisions.

The same appears to be the case with other consultative bodies who again are quite happy to do a complete U-turn and declare that they have no concerns after previously expressing considerable concerns.

It seems to the layman that all such consultative processes are mere formalities to give the appearance of democratic process, when the reality is that decisions are already made; indeed one suspects the plans for development are already well advanced and there is nothing that residents can say or do to alter this process.

Any reasonable and logical objections concerning traffic congestion and increased flooding risks will simply be brushed aside with questionable assurances from people who know full well they will not be held accountable should the objections later be shown to have had substance.

So, simply get on and build your houses and stop wasting OUR money on these pointless exercises.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD04: Para 17**

Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD04: Para 17 Reference No. 891  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation Southern Water  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

The year of the Water Resources Management Plan mentioned in paragraph 17 of Appendix RD4 should be 2007 not 2009.

It is Southern Water's understanding, based on information from Defra, that nitrogen removal will not be required at Shoreham Wastewater Treatment Works over the lifetime of Adur's Local Plan. Therefore, the reference to environmental regulations in the position statement on Water Supply and Treatment in Section B can be removed.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD06: Monitoring**

Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD06: Monitoring

Reference No. 916

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Hargreaves Management Limited

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Representations from Hargreaves Management Limited

As significant landowners within the Adur area and particularly, Shoreham, Hargreaves have considered the revised draft Local Plan and have the following comments / observations.

Appendix R6 – Revised Draft Policy 4

The employment space should not just be “to meet local needs” but instead the needs of the wider South-East, having regard to Companies that wish to locate to Shoreham. It is short-sighted to merely consider the land needed for existing local Companies when, by implication Companies are transient and locate to areas for a number of reasons.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD08: Shoreham Harbour**

Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD08: Shoreham Harbour

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

APPENDIX RD8

10: Please refer to the transport study as the ‘Adur Local Plan and Shoreham Harbour Transport Study 2013’.

11: The key objectives of the Shoreham Town Centre Study are to:

- Improve the town centre for vehicular movement and circulation efficiency, enhance pedestrian accessibility and manage air quality.
  - Mitigate the impact of the proposed development levels from Shoreham Harbour Western Arm on Shoreham Town Centre.
-

**Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD10: Transport Assessment**

Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD10: Transport Assessment

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

## APPENDIX RD10

In the first sentence, please amend 'assessment' to 'study'.

Results of the Study: In the fourth and fifth bullet points, please clarify that the traffic increase and increase in journey time is when the development scenarios are compared to the reference case (and before the mitigation strategy is applied). It may be useful to use sub-headings and include the 'with mitigation' results after the description of the mitigation measures.

A283 / A259 Shoreham High Street junction: For the third sentence, reference to operating within capacity should be removed. The key test outlined in paragraph 32 of the NPPF is whether the 'residual cumulative impacts of development are severe'. Please amend 'ensure this junction operates within capacity' to 'ensure there is not a severe residual impact'.

A259 / A2025 South Street junction: For the second sentence, please refer to the comment above regarding the key test in the NPPF.

A27 Shoreham Bypass / Hangleton Link: a risk exists that further costs such as land acquisition or a retaining wall could be identified once more design work has been undertaken on the extent of earthworks that would be required to accommodate the widened slip lane merge. The indicative estimate effectively assumes that the widened cutting could be accommodated within available land. The contingency applied to the estimate of 35% allows for variation to the costs identified in the estimate, but is not intended to account for land purchase or a structure to avoid land take, not included in PB's indicative design.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Appendix RD10: Transport Assessment

Reference No. 973

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sustrans

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### KEY ISSUE 7 (p13)

The need to address road congestion and related pollution – air and noise – whilst improving the existing transport network.

The Active Travel Strategy from the Department of Health and Department for Transport (February 2010) argued that putting walking and cycling at the heart of local transport and public health strategies will improve public health, tackle congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve the local environment.

The vision, objectives, and policies do not place sustainable transport at the heart of the Adur Local Plan. The overall impression is that sustainable transport is regarded as a mitigation measure to manage increasing levels of congestion and air pollution. Long-term, strategic investment in sustainable modes of transport has the potential to deliver against a far greater range the ALP's objectives. Moreover, using the Government's own methods of assessing the economic benefits of transport schemes, Sustrans has shown that local walking and cycling schemes have a benefit to cost ratio of 20:1. In times of severe budget restrictions this sits in stark contrast to the typical ratio of just 3:1 for other transport schemes such as rail and roads.

The comments that follow illustrate these points.

Waves Ahead – The Sustainable Community Strategy (1.38: p14)

Investment in measures that would make walking and cycling an attractive travel choice would contribute to all the objectives of the 'Waves Ahead' sustainable community strategy:

The health and well-being of active travel;

The social inclusion that comes with making walking and cycling a safe and affordable travel choice for people of all ages and abilities;

The economic benefits of reducing congestion;

The environmental benefits that would help to make Adur a better place to live.

Active, sustainable transport needs to be at the heart of the Adur Local Plan if this potential is to be realised. A clear strategic vision is critically important and Sustrans would like to see this recognised in the vision and objectives of the ALP.

In the current environment funding comes from a variety of sources and decision making is devolved to a number of different bodies. Without strategic direction and commitment, there is a high risk that spending on sustainable transport is piecemeal; schemes are not planned in a joined-up way; and value-for-money is not achieved and benefits to the community are not realised.

Travel Behaviour Change Programmes (Appendix RD10)

Travel behaviour change (TBC) programmes (p217) could be run across the whole of Adur to meet an objective of modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. It is not clear what evidence supports the statement that travel behaviour change programmes "have the greatest impact... within and around the development sites" (p217). Placed in this Appendix, it would appear that TBC programmes are viewed purely as a mitigation measure to help manage increasing levels of congestion. This sells short the potential benefits and value for money that might be achieved. Significant benefits against a wider range of objectives might be achieved by running TBC programmes within existing urban areas across Adur.

Junction Improvements (Appendix RD10)

"Highway mitigation schemes are required for nine of thirteen key junctions" (p217). By managing congestion at these points, road transport becomes a more attractive option. No evidence is presented to show that the congestion (and associated problems such as air pollution) is not shifted to other points on the road network. Sustrans would like to see:

A cost-benefit analysis comparing the value of these highway mitigation schemes against investment in sustainable modes of transport.

An assessment of ALP objectives that are met by the highway mitigation schemes compared to investment in sustainable modes of transport.

The observation is made that in West Sussex a number of highway mitigation schemes, while managing greater volumes of traffic, have been

detrimental to cycling.

#### Strategic Cycle Routes

While specific junctions have been identified for mitigation measures (Appendix RD10) and 'proposed roundabout options' drawn up (Map 7, p54), measures to improve sustainable modes of transport are mostly generalised statements of intent with caveats such as "where feasible".

Sustrans would like to see included in the Adur Local Plan a commitment to develop high quality cycle routes in two key areas to improve access into and out of Shoreham. This would be consistent with other policies in the Adur Local Plan: Revised Draft Policy 13 (p92): "Improvements to green infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle links, will be supported". Revised Draft Policy 26: The Visitor Economy (p121). "Access (including new footpaths, cycleways and slipways) to the river, the coast and the South Downs National Park should be improved where possible". Shoreham Harbour Regeneration (p63): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path that links the new Adur Ferry Bridge with Southwick Locks, suitable for both leisure and utility cyclists. This would become the new alignment of National Cycle Network Route 2, rather than the existing inland route.

Shoreham Airport (p51): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path between North Lancing and the Adur Tollbridge. An improved cycle and walking crossing of the A27 to link the Old Shoreham Road and Coombes Road to provide access to Lancing College, the South Downs National Park and Steyning. A signed cycle route through the Airport linking the Downslink Path at the Adur Tollbridge to National Cycle Network Route 2 east of Widewater Lagoon.

The proposed roundabout changes at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm (p54) should be designed with high-quality cycle routes as part of the brief. The designs presented in Map 7 (p54) would appear to be designed to manage increased traffic levels. Designs that also make cycling a more attractive travel choice would also help to manage the levels of traffic.

#### Cycling in Urban Areas

Sustrans would like to see a policy commitment in the Adur Local Plan to make urban areas more attractive to cycling so that a bike ride is a safe, quick and affordable travel choice for trips to local amenities. This might include:

Designating or upgrading suitable footpaths as shared-use space, such as the existing link between Nicolson Drive and Middle Road in Shoreham.

Introducing cycling contraflows on one-way streets, such as in East Street, Shoreham.

Reducing speed limits on all residential roads to 20mph.

In the same way that specific road junctions have been identified, mitigation measures could be identified to remove barriers to access on foot or by bike to important destinations, such as schools, health centres, railway stations, and shops.

---

#### Map/Para/Policy: Draft Infrastructure Plan

Map/Para/Policy: Draft Infrastructure Plan

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Section C – Implementation Plan

Throughout the Flood Risk Management sections, please include mitigation of groundwater risks as well as surface water risk.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: General**

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 967

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Highways Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Thank you for consulting the Highways Agency on the Adur Revised Draft Local Plan.

We are engaging with your Council on Local Plan issues that affect the strategic road network. We will also look to the detailed Transport Assessments supporting individual development applications to ensure that any impacts upon the strategic road network are not severe.

We do not have any comments to make on the Revised Draft Local Plan at this time and look forward to continuing to work with you as you progress the Plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 54

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I have lived on this estate for 36 yrs and my wife for 59. We strongly object to any further building on any land north or flood plain surrounding the West Beach / former Hasler Estate. The flood plain protects our homes from flooding. If any further building is carried out WE WILL FLOOD. Today (4/11/13) is a prime example . I have just driven along West Way. West Way and other roads leading from it are severely flooded. Indeed even the pavements are covered and water is lapping the gates of houses and entering gardens. Some residents are even using sandbags. One could paddle a canoe which on other occasions I have witnessed. We live beside a field and there is water outside our house and indeed coming up in our front garden which we have never witnessed be fire. On occasions there are huge puddles / small lakes on the fields beside us. Where would all this water go if further building is carried out.

---

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

3.00

## SOUNDNESS OF THE REVISED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

3.01

Criteria for testing the document: legal compliance and soundness

The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) © 2012 states that when assessing whether a Local Plan Document is legally compliant the inspector will look at whether the document preparation and consultation procedures meet the requirements of the Act and Regulations.

In terms of 'soundness' the inspector will look at four main areas:

- Justified: the proposed policies are founded on a robust and credible evidence base and should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.
- Effective: the proposed policies are deliverable, flexible and able to be monitored.
- The proposed policies are consistent with National Policy: where there is a departure, local planning authorities must provide clear and convincing reasoning to justify their approach.
- Positively prepared: which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.

3.02

Justified

In terms of justification the Local Authority has commissioned a number of studies to help inform their decision making in the preparation of the Local Plan: these include the Urban Fringe Study 2006, Landscape & Ecology Study 2012 and site specific Sustainability Appraisals. The conclusions of all these reports provide clear evidence to support the allocation of the Steyning Road site, as a reasonable alternative, ahead of the proposed site allocations at New Monks Farm, Sompting and Shoreham Airport. (See Appendix B – Sites Comparison Table) The report's conclusions also demonstrate this site is the least constrained overall, when assessed by all the key criteria. Furthermore, the conclusions overwhelmingly demonstrate that the proposed allocation of land at Shoreham Airport is inappropriate. Therefore, evidence supporting the policies for allocating employment land within the Shoreham Airfield and land at New Monks Farm for employment and housing are not robust or credible.

3.03

Effective

The evidence shows that there are considerable delivery risks associated with the allocation of land on the Shoreham Airfield due to the dependency of the TWS, the timescale and funding of which is not guaranteed. There are also considerable delivery risks, based on economic viability, with the allocation of the New Monks Farm site, which is dependent on a large amount of infrastructure, including a new roundabout and access road (to be shared with the proposed new land allocation at the airfield).

3.04

National Policy

The proposed strategic land allocation for employment use within the Shoreham Airfield, classified as 'functional floodplain' (zone 3b), is not consistent with NPPF, which requires safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management. Nor is it consistent with the NPPF requirement not to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere because implementation of the proposed TWS will eliminate the Shoreham Airfield area as a flood management area and increase the risk to areas on the east bank, currently within zone 3a (high risk), including the majority of the Steyning Road site and the area surrounding the A27 interchange.

3.05

Positively prepared

The Revised Draft Local Plan does not meet its objectively assessed housing needs. There will be a shortfall of around 87 dwellings per year over the plan period. Furthermore, the Council will not be able to demonstrate that it has made every effort to meet its full housing needs or that it has properly considered all reasonable alternatives by excluding the Steyning Road site, which when measured against the same evidence based criteria as all the other strategic land allocations is the least constrained overall.

---

Map/Para/Policy:    General

Reference No.        987

Relates To Map     Relates To Paragraph     Relates to Policy

Organisation        Natural England

Comments            Support     Object     Comment

Agent's Organisation

We broadly welcome the changes made in the context of our previous comments although (as above) there are still some points that could be strengthened or elements added to policies – mostly around the protected sites and landscape impacts on the Green Gaps within the district. Due to the current pressure of consultations on land-use plans, I have not been able to spend the time I would have wished reviewing and commenting on your draft plan. Nevertheless, I hope you find these comments helpful.

---

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

## RESPONSE TO REVISED DRAFT, ADUR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2013

The Shoreham Society welcomes being consulted on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan. Following publishing of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2011, which replaced previous planning policy documents, the role of Local Plans has become more important as they provide the framework for future development within the District.

Our previous comments on the Local Plan made last year are still relevant but we would like to be quite clear what the Adur Local plan is for. We feel it is to enhance the quality of life for Adur residents. At the very least, it should halt any deterioration in this quality of life, which might occur with inappropriate development or poor advance planning.

We know that developers are inclined to come in and make money from the area – that is their core business – but if allowed, this could be with little regard to the character of the town. We know that traffic will increase with development although the growing use of electric vehicles may contain pollution to existing levels.

However we note that parts of the plan are bland, toothless and fairly vague. There is a great deal of aspirational padding which sounds nice and which hardly anyone could disagree with, yet sometimes no substantial proposals follow.

So how well does the plan serve Shoreham?

Detailed comments on the document are set out as below:

Eleven key 'needs' are listed for the plan to address, three in particular being of interest to the Shoreham Society. These are:

Key Issue 3 – Balance: Allow development whilst retaining environmental quality

Key Issue 7 – Reduce road congestion and pollution

Key Issue 11 – Preserve or enhance the quality of the environment (built, historic and natural)

We have identified the main policies that pertain to these issues and have made comments against those that we think need strengthening or where Society members have made suggestions.

---

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The key objections raised in this representation are that the Revised Draft Local Plan (DLP) has:-

- not consistently met all its obligations under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
- overlooked the Steyning Road site, which is less constrained overall and more deliverable than the proposed strategic land allocation sites; (See Appendix B – Sites Comparison Table)
- sacrifices large areas of the Lancing and Sompting Local Green Gaps at far too high a cost financially, environmentally and visually for the benefit presumed;
- not been consistent in its evaluation of the evidence based studies, or fair in representing their conclusions, when assessing all reasonable options for strategic land allocations, instead, preferring to favour a small number of larger sites, despite their obvious and significant constraints. (See Appendix C – Sustainability assessment and Appendix D Analysis of the SA).

This representation proposes a number of amendments to the Revised DLP in, as a positive contribution to the consultation process.

---

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 703

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

'PLEASE SEE ORIGINAL'.

No infrastructure to take account of increased risk of flooding and road traffic:-

- a) No additional access roads to take up the increase in traffic already spawned by recent and future building on Shoreham Beach.
- b) Current situation, there is too much transport queuing both ways over Norfolk Bridge.
- c) Eventual gridlock.
- d) Lack of access routes to and from the West Beach Estate if the plans proceed, the area is historically and increasingly prone to serious flooding during inclement weather. Building more houses will only increase the risk and the amount of traffic for people trying to get to work.
- e) The road adjacent to the shops is seriously flooded in places to the whole of the pavement area requiring substantial repairs and improvements to drainage. The sole access road is used by the the general public to visit the shops, as well as the estate and caravan park residents. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the council to carry out the necessary work as soon as possible.
- f) The new football training grounds and buildings have served as a warning to residents and the council by pushing floodwaters further down towards West Beach and the airport. Incidents of flooding on the estate are increasing. The land (as it is) protects the estate from excessive flooding, and I believe that this is why over the years, applications for planning consent have been turned down after reference to the water authority of the day.
- g) If a way is found to drain the land, it is likely to cause subsidence to properties on the existing estate.
- h) Landstone, who have bought the land to the north of the West Beach Estate ,and it seem the rights of way across the estate without consultation with residents, have done nothing to improve the pavements and roads; and therefore the health and safety of residents, of whom many are elderly.
- i) Residents pay water charges and council rates comparable to other areas, yet we have to endure broken pavements, hazardous roads, flooding and burst water and sewage pipes. Landstone and I submit that the council are putting a gun to the heads of residents in order to gain planning consents to build 1000s of houses on a flood plain, which is likely to produce more flooding.
- j) I believe that the area is overcrowded and more houses will only make matters worse by causing more flooding. It is unlikely that any infrastructure improvements can cope with the proposed schemes.

We are already overcrowded; don't allow the profit takes to undermine what remains of our quality of life.

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 989

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Conservative Party

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to you with a breakdown of the results for the 'Mind the Gap' consultation which was conducted alongside the Draft Adur Local Plan consultation. I, along with Local Conservative Councillors, believed it was necessary to communicate further with local residents and perform our own consultation to reflect the significant concern that has been caused by the housebuilding proposals in the Draft Plan.

Surveys were carried out in both Lancing and Sompting by asking residents to state why they think Adur District Council should change the Local Plan.

The results are as follow:

#### LANCING.

The main concerns to arise from the Lancing Survey were:

1. 90% of the respondents feared that further housebuilding on the flood plain would exacerbate the flood problems they already face.
2. 80% were concerned that the A27 would not be able to cope with the extra traffic - given that it is already stretched.
3. 20% were worried about damage to the environment and green spaces.
4. 15% were concerned about increase pressure on public services and other local infrastructure.
5. 10% feared increased house insurance premiums due to living in a higher flood risk area.

#### SOMPTING.

Similar concerns developed from the Sompting survey:

1. 80% of respondents were concerned that the A27 would not be able to cope with the extra traffic - given that it is already stretched.
2. 40% were concerned about damage to the environment and green spaces.
3. 35% were worried about increased pressure on public services and other local infrastructure.
4. 30% feared flooding resulting from development on flood plain.

No respondents were in favour of the proposals.

I would like to point out that residents were urged to complete the formal Adur Local Plan submission as a priority. This was emphasised at the two public meetings we held at Sompting and Lancing, attracting around 200 and 120 members of the public respectively.

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The revised draft Adur Local Plan provides a clear strategy for how Adur District Council will plan for future development. The County Council welcomes the positive approach to encouraging sustainable modes of transport and is supportive of the findings set out in the transport evidence base. However, further work is suggested to demonstrate that flood risk issues for the proposed strategic allocations can be overcome to meet the requirements of the Exception Test.

---

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

## RESPONSE OF CPRE SUSSEX TO REVISED DRAFT ADUR LOCAL PLAN

CPRE Sussex has a number of comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan, which we trust the Council will take into account in progressing the Local Plan:

We welcome and support Clause V7 of the Vision, Objective 6, Objective 7 (although it should refer to the character of the coastal waterfront and Local Green Gaps) and the following Revised Draft Policies:

10 Sompting

13 Adur's Countryside and Coast

14 Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm

17 The Energy Hierarchy

18 Sustainable Design

30 Green Infrastructure

31 Biodiversity

34 Pollution and Contamination

35 Water Quality and Protection

37 Telecommunications

However, we do have a number of objections, as follows.

In principle, we are supportive of V1 of the Vision. However, "quality of life and wellbeing" should not be measured only in terms of economic and social measures. Environmental quality is equally important. Open countryside offers a range of benefits to quality of life and wellbeing such as landscape, biodiversity, fresh air and a carbon dioxide sink.

Conclusion.

It is clear to CPRE Sussex that the Revised Draft Local Plan contains significant flaws in its housing strategy and site allocation. The number and range of environmental constraints that the site allocations at New Monks Farm, West Sompting and Shoreham Airport would breach incontrovertibly mean that the Local Plan would fail to deliver sustainable development and would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and should be considered unsound. The Local Plan needs a significant rethink and we hope that the District Council will accept this.

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This response builds on the feedback we gave in October 2012.

Economic regeneration is key to the survival and recovery of Adur and as such we are pleased to see land being allocated for development with minimum impact on green gaps. We are concerned that the reduction in total employment land allocation from the previous round of consultations will have a negative effect on growth and would encourage this allocation being increased in a sensitive and sustainable manner.

As a world class business, we need world class infrastructure and access to maintain our investments in Adur, impress our clients and attract the best staff. We are not convinced that this has been recognised as a strategic need and that aspiration to regenerate and grow the area has been somewhat compromised. The journey experience from Brighton hotels to our site needs to be positive whether on A27 or A259.

We want to see an increase in quantitative analysis in the trade-offs between employment space and environmental matters. The current trade-offs are too subjective to enable judgements to be made. The amount of material to absorb is substantial, so we have taken a principles based approach to our response. We note that there is little reference to the Government's plans in "Investing in Britain".

We also support the response from the Shoreham Airport Consultative Committee.

The various planning policies need amendment to cover the following:

Essential – plan not deemed viable without all of these

- A27 fit for purpose from Sussex Pad to west of Chichester – include minimum peak time average speed 30 mph though Worthing, Lancing, Arundel and around Chichester bypass, essentially on current track with proper cycle ways and foot paths. Traffic flow improvements to reduce emissions and journey times – A259 and other local roads as well as A27
  - No loss of access on either side of improved or replaced Sussex Pad junction and early implementation of an upgrade which is as east as possible, the need to encourage National Park access and maintain foot, cycle and horse crossing to the Coombes Road from the southern side of the current junction
    - oEast west access on both sides of the junction is essential for both the needs of the Airport users, tenants and visitors, Northbrook staff and students and Ricardo as well as those of Lancing College and others using the Coombes Road and for access to the National Park
    - oThe junction needs to be as far east as is possible, noting runway approach issues and design constraints of the dome and travellers site – complex and long access roads will materially increase inconvenience to our visitors and staff and reduce development viability
  - Improved southern access to/from the airport to the A259
  - Strong mix of employment types across Adur
  - Early completion of flood defence and surface water management measures so that the airport and other unprotected employment and housing locations east and west of the river Adur are equally protected from tidal and fluvial flooding. The Adur Tidal Walls Scheme should be accelerated to enable faster growth.
  - An overall approach which inspires the community and increases aspiration, particularly in LNIAs and other deprived and hard to reach groups
  - Development in line with Waves Ahead
  - Sustainable developments which equally balance environmentally and economically sustainability
  - Development on the airport which supports aviation use as well as complementary added value mixed employment growth
  - Shoreham Harbour and Airport broadly developing in parallel to ensure balanced regeneration as part of the proposed Greater Brighton City Deal
  - A variety of housing supply to support those who will be employed in the new and regenerated employment land allocations
- Expected – plan unlikely to deliver objectives without these
- Flexible time phased implementation plans (no back end loading)
  - Local infrastructure in place just before demand exists, not afterwards

- Employment growth planning linked to sustainable transport and reducing commuting
- Bus routes going into the airport and other large employment areas to reduce parking load
- Educational investment in skills growth to meet employment needs
- The Withy Patch site should be allowed to change shape and modestly grow to maximise the junction enhancements and should be considered for modest expansion
- Use of Growing Places and similar funds to unlock developments
- CIL/s106 is only used when it does not impact the economic viability of a development

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Checklist of Main Suggestions made by Shoreham Society Members:

- Civic Centre ex-staff car park retained
- Dolphin Road becomes through road
- New Airport road: Sussex Pad to Saltings
- Subway opened under level crossing
- Foot & cycle bridge over A259

On a more general note a significant amount of Society members expressed concern over

- Infrastructure: local health provision for an increasingly ageing population and schools
- Air quality and traffic
- Maintaining the community and character of Shoreham centre

Thank you for considering Shoreham Society's comments. Committee Members look forward to being updated on progress on this matter and would welcome being consulted in the future on any similar matters. Although we realise that some of our suggestions may not be possible to implement we would appreciate being told the specific reasons why and the preferred ADC alternative.

Map/Para/Policy: General

Reference No. 888

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation DC Planning Ltd

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 02: Key Features of Adur**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 02: Key Features of Adur

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references in paragraph 1.13 to the physical extent of the plan area not extending into the South Downs National Park and in Map 2. However, SDNPA suggests that the boundary of the plan area is made clearer on the Map so that the reader can be left in no doubt the area that the plan covers.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 709

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 3 - Sompting North, loss of more green gap.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 708

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 3 - Huge loss of green gap.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 952

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the proposed housing (2) at West Sompting. The access to such a site would be horrendous. West Street is a tiny village road with speed humps and not enough room for two way traffic as it is. I come from Shoreham to Littlehampton on my way back from work currently and I avoid that whole Lancing/Sompting/Worthing A27 area and take the Steyning/Storrington/Arundel route, as the former is a total under invested disaster zone of utter mind blowing congestion. I am also told that this is a flood plain and that there is no more health and schooling capacity already. Please drop this plan, as it makes no sense at all and will cause misery for not just the current residents, but also the poor hapless unsuspecting new ones.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 975

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation New Monks Farm Development Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Enplan UK Ltd

We object to the reference: 'proposed Local Green Gap' (see below for more detail). In addition, we consider that the Proposed Built Up Area Boundary (coloured orange) should include the strategic allocation of NMF.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 676

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 3 - Loss of green gap in Sompting North

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 929

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

New Monks Farm and West Sompting sites have a huge negative impact upon the already overloaded A27.

Shoreham Airport development impinges upon the River (SSSI) and linked habitat. The site allocated is a feeding ground for birds, particularly Lapwings - a species of conservation concern as they are losing suitable habitats. This allocation would further reduce their habitat.

I do wonder what potential there is for developing brownfield such as the old Cement Works and land on the opposite side of the road from the old Cement Works? These are eyesores on land abutting the South Downs National Park. Green views from the National park would be eroded by all the proposed site allocations.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 03: Site Allocations

Reference No. 897

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Kerry Brown Design

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the Adur Local Plan in reference to Map 3 page 30 site 2, where there are outlines to potentially build 480 homes on a 'strategic gap'. I believe that the impact to the services in an area that has huge traffic issues would be detrimental. We already suffer from overflow traffic from the A27 using the village as a short cut and sometimes I can't turn into my road due to tailbacks along West Street. I also believe that the fields are marshland and help absorb water drain from the South Downs. I have a young son and look forward to him attending Sompting Primary School, I don't think that the school could cope with expansion and also the Ball Tree Surgery. The infrastructure to the area outlined is already under massive pressure.

---

## Map/Para/Policy: Map 05: Proposed Allocation at West Sompting

Map/Para/Policy: Map 05: Proposed Allocation at West Sompting

Reference No. 936

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- I am shocked and extremely concerned at the proposed allocation of over 1000 new homes in West Sompting. Sompting is currently overwhelmed by horrendous trafficking issues, particularly during the rush hours along West Street. In an attempt to avoid the frequent one-mile long west-bound traffic jam along the A27 tailing back from Lyons Farm, vehicles constantly cut down from the A27 via Western Road, Dankton Lane or Church Lane onto West Street. Any traffic heading east along West Street then grinds to a halt due to frequent narrow areas of the road where only one car can pass. This subsequently leads to a traffic stand still tailing back along West Street, running from Lyons Farm to Loose Lane. Now, let's work by the rule that the average household has two cars. Therefore, one-thousand new homes equal two-thousand new cars. How on earth will Sompting cope with this? It's simple. It won't. These plans have been put together by people who have very little knowledge or understanding of the current trafficking issues faced by residents of Sompting. Instead of proposing developments for new homes, we should be looking for a way to solve the traffic issues currently faced. Bus journeys are pointless as they are always late. Emergency services have NO chance of effectively using the road should they need to respond to an emergency. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?
  - Sompting is a little village between the South Downs and the sea. There is a lot of water around coming from the downs and in from the sea. As a result Sompting frequently floods, particularly during the winter months. In 2012 Bognor Regis flooded. The flooding in North Bersted was the fault of Arun District Council, Barkley Homes and Charles Church, who constructed over 600 houses on flood plains; similar to those proposed in Sompting, which until the construction started had provided a natural form of drainage for this amount of rain. Arun was warned about flooding by local residents and environmental agencies. If the flooding in Sompting becomes a more serious issue than it already is, Adur District Council be solely responsible for the upset and damage to homes that will inevitably be caused. Look at what happened to all of the homes of Lancing residents living south of Lancing Manor Leisure Centre in 2012. We are talking about massive flooding less than one and half miles from the proposed Sompting developments. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?
  - In the development plan there appears to be little or no provision for extra policing, extra shops, extra doctor's surgeries, hospitals or even schools to cope with the demand of residents from over one thousand new homes. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?
  - What environmental impact will this development have to all the wildlife that has been on the Sompting gap for hundreds of years and use it as a migration path? How is this acceptable?
  - I am disappointed, angered and saddened as it appears that Adur District Council has no idea of the issues we face as residents of Sompting. You should be working to improve our quality of life. What you are proposing suggests you don't care.
  - These points highlight my major concerns with this proposed development.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Map 05: Proposed Allocation at West Sompting

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Please see below maps showing flood plains etc. The objections on this map are:

- Recycling Area to South and leeching of toxics into the ground to be built on.
  - Chemical Plan to West and risk of Fire/Blast zone being less than what was there.
  - The amount of traffic using new exit to West Street (on both build sites).
  - The amount of traffic using new exit to Loose Lane.
  - The orchard and trees NOT acting as noise of windbreak.
  - The current ditches (riparian rights) that need to be maintained to stop flooding.
  - Conflict with wildlife.
  - Whether the land can accommodate that amount of new build without excess flooding.
  - It is all housing no extra schools for Sompting village, doctors or shops (yes aware Lyons Farm up road if can get to it due to new traffic).
  - Impact of flooding off train line.
  - Lose of Equine grazing and means of downtime for owners due to further afield locations if can.
  - Destruction of wildlife corridors.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Map 05: Proposed Allocation at West Sompting

Reference No. 937

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- I am shocked and extremely concerned at the proposed allocation of over 1000 new homes in West Sompting. Sompting is currently overwhelmed by horrendous trafficking issues, particularly during the rush hours along West Street. In an attempt to avoid the frequent one-mile long west-bound traffic jam along the A27 tailing back from Lyons Farm, vehicles constantly cut down from the A27 via Western Road, Dankton Lane or Church Lane onto West Street. Any traffic heading east along West Street then grinds to a halt due to frequent narrow areas of the road where only one car can pass. This subsequently leads to a traffic stand still tailing back along West Street, running from Lyons Farm to Loose Lane. Now, let's work by the rule that the average household has two cars. Therefore, one-thousand new homes equal two-thousand new cars. How on earth will Sompting cope with this? It's simple. It won't. These plans have been put together by people who have very little knowledge or understanding of the current trafficking issues faced by residents of Sompting. Instead of proposing developments for new homes, we should be looking for a way to solve the traffic issues currently faced. Bus journeys are pointless as they are always late. Emergency services have NO chance of effectively using the road should they need to respond to an emergency. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?

- Sompting is a little village between the South Downs and the sea. There is a lot of water around coming from the downs and in from the sea. As a result Sompting frequently floods, particularly during the winter months. In 2012 Bognor Regis flooded. The flooding in North Bersted was the fault of Arun District Council, Barkley Homes and Charles Church, who constructed over 600 houses on flood plains; similar to those proposed in Sompting, which until the construction started had provided a natural form of drainage for this amount of rain. Arun was warned about flooding by local residents and environmental agencies. If the flooding in Sompting becomes a more serious issue than it already is, Adur District Council be solely responsible for the upset and damage to homes that will inevitably be caused. Look at what happened to all of the homes of Lancing residents living south of Lancing Manor Leisure Centre in 2012. We are talking about massive flooding less than one and half miles from the proposed Sompting developments. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?

- In the development plan there appears to be little or no provision for extra policing, extra shops, extra doctor's surgeries, hospitals or even schools to cope with the demand of residents from over one thousand new homes. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?

- What environmental impact will this development have to all the wildlife that has been on the Sompting gap for hundreds of years and use it as a migration path? How is this acceptable?

- I am disappointed, angered and saddened as it appears that Adur District Council has no idea of the issues we face as residents of Sompting. You should be working to improve our quality of life. What you are proposing suggests you don't care.

- These points highlight my major concerns with this proposed development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 05: Proposed Allocation at West Sompting

Reference No. 420

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Friends of Cokeham Reed Beds

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Friends of Cokeham Reed Beds

LAND AT WEST SOMPTING MAP5 HOUSING ALLOCATION

STRATEGIC GREEN GAP 2013 FLOODING & GROUND WATER FLOODING

Land at West Sompting - Map 5 Sompting lies within the flood zone 1, 2, 3a and 3b.

I condemn this as complete folly. You cannot control storm water and groundwater like traffic.

Building on a flood plain will be a builders nightmare, to cover a large area in concrete to accommodate 400 dwellings south of West Street, plus roads and footpaths with main drains to 400 dwellings will be like compressing apples in an apple press to make cider. The difference is the sea which doesn't know the difference between flood zone 1,2,3a and 3b with extreme water patterns and spring tides. With heavy rain we can expect more flooding due to the build - up of flood water and ground water not being able to drain away at spring high tides, water backing up roads, sewer and main drains into homes, not very pleasant and a health hazard.

The flood zone starts at the South Downs above Sompting, the flood course starts at Steyning Bowl to Beggars Bush - Steep Down - Titch Hill Farm - Dankton Lane - Herbert Road - Valley Road. Ground water starts to rise in West Street and the basement houses get flooded and West Street is awash with floodwater.

There is an Aerial view video on flooding held at Adur District Council files showing the extent of flooding from Steyning Bowl to Sompting, taking in Lancing to Shoreham Airport.

I am also concerned about the wind farm planned off the South Coast, and the electrical cable crossing over the floodplain in the Sompting Strategic Gap right up to Bolney. To excavate a deep channel for the electrical cables may contribute further flooding.

Map/Para/Policy: Map 05: Proposed Allocation at West Sompting

Reference No. 757

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 5.

I am writing to express that I strongly object to the proposed plans ref map 5 Sompting/Lancing.

This proposition is ludicrous and most certainly unacceptable for the following reasons and I am completely appalled that any consideration is one again been given to develop any of the surrounding land here in Sompting Village.

1. Highway and access - The traffic situation in West Street is intolerable. Church Lane and West Street are rat runs for the traffic heading West on the A27, drivers cut down from the dual carriage way into Church Lane with speed and aggression. They fly over the mini roundabout, take a left turn and belt down West Street impatiently oblivious to other drivers and certainly pedestrians. We are subjected to our cars being scraped, scratched, knocked and wing mirrors ripped off constantly. Of course no notes have been left and there's road rage and swearing along the way. Sometimes this surmounts to at least 500 vehicles per hour at peak times heading West and some 300 heading East. I can no longer make any claims for repairs to my car, my excess is through the roof and at this rate I will eventually be unable to get insurance. I believe there is evidence of these statistics on the WSCC Survey Oct 2006. So how can one justify any further increase in the usage of these roads. These dwellings would create a huge increase of vehicles usage on a day to day basis; this will compound the hazardous traffic situation in West Street and will completely negate the efforts of ADC and Sompting Parish Councils introduction to traffic calming measures.

2. Since the mid 1990s, WSCC and ADC clearly deemed the village of Sompting as a conservation area and development would be detrimental to the amenity of the village community. I moved here 14 years ago largely for this reason - to get out of the town and be closer to the countryside. The nursey over the road, which was previously at threat of development, is a growth of trees surrounded by beautiful flint walls and home to probably some 30 species of birds at least, bats, badgers, foxes, weasels, stoats, hedgehogs and not to mention local grazing for horses. The green areas across the road and behind me clearly illustrate what we have left of a 'countryside village'.

3. This development is an infringement on the strategic gap between us and the A27 the monster road. It would be a complete invasion to our privacy and of the neighbouring homes in our village. Parking will also become a major problem.

4. The population would be significantly increased. We chose to live in a village for the village life, not a town. I walk my dog daily up Church Lane and cross over to the opposite fields and already take my life in my hands with the traffic. I can no longer wash my car on the road as I have so many times nearly been hit and sworn at for doing this task outside of my own home. Any new development will continue to destroy the green areas left and will be taken away forever causing an irrecoverable effect on the village. If this is allowed, it will surely open the floodgate to further and completely undesirable new proposed developments.

5. If this development is allowed then no strategic gap, Greenfield site or conservation area and village anywhere in the countryside is safe from the greed of the developer.

6. SAVE OUR SOMPTING. Leave us alone and go and find somewhere less rural to build houses. Don't spoil what little we have left and already

completely over exposed by the outrageously dangerous and treacherous road on our very own doorsteps, created by the over development and bad planning. Just think before you make anymore mistakes.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 06: Proposed Allocation at Shoreham Airport**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 06: Proposed Allocation at Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 893

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Transair Flight Equipment

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the proposed commercial development at Shoreham Airport unless the property is solely for 'aviation use'. When Transair relocated its aviation business to Shoreham Airport in 1999 all of the airport based property was dedicated for aviation use only.

Clearly this requirement has been allowed to slip greatly over the past 14 years to a point where only around 50% of buildings are dedicated to aviation.

The airport could have an excellent future as a hub for general aviation in the UK only if development is restricted to aviation use, this may not be as profitable for the London based property development company which owns Shoreham Airport, but additional aviation use only buildings and hangars would encourage aviation companied like Transair to make further investment in the infrastructure of the airport. This will not happen whilst there is doubt as to the future of the airport remaining an airport.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Proposed Roundabout Options**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Proposed Roundabout Options

Reference No. 828

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation SAOTA Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Roundabout 1 Shoreham Airport is unsuitable for the following reasons.

1. There is constant, and at peak times, considerable non airport related through traffic between Saltings roundabout via New Salts Farm and the airport perimeter track to the A27. Salts Farm Road is a private narrow road, hardly suited to even the existing level of traffic. Positioning a new roundabout and removing the traffic lights at the Sussex Pad would encourage even more traffic to use this shortcut.
2. This roundabout reduces the green gap and impairs the visual aspect from Lancing college and Shoreham residents and visitors.

Roundabout 2 New Monks Farm is preferable.

1. With this layout, shortcut traffic would double back on itself and thus this unsuitable practice would be discouraged.
  2. The proposed plan reduces the available distance between road traffic and the runway threshold. European Aviation Safety Agency regulations are unpredictable and are often of a 'one size fits all' nature. Heavy costs would be incurred if moving the roundabout or runway direction is required by future legislation. No changes should be made by the Highways Agency that could jeopardise the ability to comply with aviation regulations now or in the future.
  3. There will be numerous objectors to Option 1 and almost none to Option 2.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Proposed Roundabout Options Reference No. 509

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

A new roundabout here is senseless overdevelopment that will impact severely on the quality of the local environment, without impacting on the level of congestion that Lancing and Worthing currently suffer from along the path of the A27.

The problem here is that we are limited physically and the current road systems are over capacity. Adding 600 (plus up to 450 in Sompting) homes to this will have a massive negative impact and putting in a roundabout isn't going to solve it.

It's time to start considering that any more development in this area is not viable and unsustainable.

Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Proposed Roundabout Options Reference No. 869

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Warbird Flying Club, Shoreham Airport

Agent's Organisation

Option 1 Roundabout- I am very concerned about the additional amount of traffic which is likely to use the 'ACCESS' road through Shoreham Airport as a through road between the Coast Road and the A27. This is an access for existing businesses and for leisure and not suitable for increased traffic. Visually a large roundabout complex such as this will intrude upon the appearance of the River Adur Valley.

Option 2 Roundabout – This will give better access to residents on the proposed New Monks Farm development still providing good access to Shoreham Airport for users.

Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Proposed Roundabout Options Reference No. 893

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Transair Flight Equipment

Agent's Organisation

My concern regards the Shoreham Airport entrance. Currently at peak times it is already difficult to exit the airport onto the A27. Clearly there will be even more congestion should the airport have to 'share' an entrance/exit from the A27 with the proposed housing development.

The airport needs to maintain its own access to the A27.

Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Proposed Roundabout Options

Reference No. 787

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The construction of a roundabout system to the A27 does not reduce the already near saturation point of traffic to the west of the proposed roundabout. The proposed development of New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport will both create an unacceptable burden on the west bound carriageway and make exiting to both east and west along the A27 from Grinstead Lane at the Manor roundabout almost impossible at busy times as there will be increased traffic and no traffic lights to break the flow. Much of this increased traffic will add to the queues further west when the Sompting traffic will join it, adding to the congestion at Worthing!

Until a suitable bypass or major road improvements are in place none of the New Monks Farm or Sompting developments should be entertained.

---

### Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Roundabout Option 1

Map/Para/Policy: Map 07: Roundabout Option 1

Reference No. 837

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Flying Time Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It is important for the future of the airport (and businesses within it) to have direct access to the A27. However the layout of the roundabout needs to be redesigned so that it does not infringe into the airport's operational boundary and fully complies with CAA CAP 168.

---

### Map/Para/Policy: Map 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Map/Para/Policy: Map 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 8: It would be useful to include the boundary of the safeguarded wharves and cross reference within the text of paragraph 2.112.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 09: Sompting and Lancing Character Area Map**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 09: Sompting and Lancing Character Area Map

Reference No. 951

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The current road systems cannot support any further development. Any development in the Northern part of the West Sompting proposal will force traffic either onto the A27 via Dankton Lane (one of the 3 oldest roads in Sompting) or West Street through Sompting village going West or via Busticle Lane going East (already a very busy route with new development on the corner with West Street and for access to the industrial estate).

Drainage is already an issue and no further development abutting the A27 should take place until this has been resolved. Sompting has been built on soggy marshland which was originally the banks and flood plain of the Broadwater rive (diverted over the years) all of this land should be kept as a strategic gap between Sompting and Broadwater.

Consultation notices should have been delivered to all residents in the area and this has not happened - my brother lives in a flat in Wheelrights Lodge, West Street, Sompting and has received no such notification.

There are no decent shops, inadequate Health and Educational facilities in the area to support the number of new homes proposed and Shoreham to Worthing will be morphed into one with each area losing its own identity.

Development of Brownfield sites must be preferable to any further development on green areas particularly as they are adjacent to the South downs National Park.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 12: Lancing Primary Shopping Area**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 12: Lancing Primary Shopping Area

Reference No. 887

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The Co-operative Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Barton Willmore LLP

**BACKGROUND**

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (“the Co-op”) and have been instructed to submit representations to the consultation on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013. This follows the submission of representations to the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan in October 2012.
2. The Co-op is an important stakeholder in Adur District, operating Town Centre ‘Co-operative Food’ stores in Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Lancing. These stores all perform important anchor roles for their respective Town Centres, generating trade, footfall and associated spin-off benefits for other retailers, in turn providing a valuable contribution to Town Centre vitality and viability.
3. Against this background, we set out our comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013 and its performance against the soundness tests contained at NPPF paragraph 182.

**Maps 12, 17 and 21 – Primary Shopping Areas**

The Co-op supports the addition of Maps identifying the proposed Primary Shopping Areas for Southwick, Lancing and Shoreham. It also supports the extent of the proposed Primary Shopping Area in each Town Centre.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 17: Shoreham Primary Shopping Area**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 17: Shoreham Primary Shopping Area

Reference No. 887

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The Co-operative Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Barton Willmore LLP

**BACKGROUND**

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (“the Co-op”) and have been instructed to submit representations to the consultation on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013. This follows the submission of representations to the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan in October 2012.
2. The Co-op is an important stakeholder in Adur District, operating Town Centre ‘Co-operative Food’ stores in Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Lancing. These stores all perform important anchor roles for their respective Town Centres, generating trade, footfall and associated spin-off benefits for other retailers, in turn providing a valuable contribution to Town Centre vitality and viability.
3. Against this background, we set out our comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013 and its performance against the soundness tests contained at NPPF paragraph 182.

**Maps 12, 17 and 21 – Primary Shopping Areas**

The Co-op supports the addition of Maps identifying the proposed Primary Shopping Areas for Southwick, Lancing and Shoreham. It also supports the extent of the proposed Primary Shopping Area in each Town Centre.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 21: Southwick Primary Shopping Area**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 21: Southwick Primary Shopping Area

Reference No. 887

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The Co-operative Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Barton Willmore LLP

**BACKGROUND**

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group ("the Co-op") and have been instructed to submit representations to the consultation on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013. This follows the submission of representations to the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan in October 2012.
2. The Co-op is an important stakeholder in Adur District, operating Town Centre 'Co-operative Food' stores in Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Lancing. These stores all perform important anchor roles for their respective Town Centres, generating trade, footfall and associated spin-off benefits for other retailers, in turn providing a valuable contribution to Town Centre vitality and viability.
3. Against this background, we set out our comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013 and its performance against the soundness tests contained at NPPF paragraph 182.

Maps 12, 17 and 21 – Primary Shopping Areas

The Co-op supports the addition of Maps identifying the proposed Primary Shopping Areas for Southwick, Lancing and Shoreham. It also supports the extent of the proposed Primary Shopping Area in each Town Centre.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Map 27: Proposed Amendment to BUAB No.4**

Map/Para/Policy: Map 27: Proposed Amendment to BUAB No.4

Reference No. 717

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I have lived in Steyning Close for 57 years and the land on Map 27 (Built Up Area Boundary No. 4) has always been cemetery-designated land. This area is bounded on these sides (East, West and South) by wads and to the North by the cemetery. All of these wads are narrow and there is no direct access to the proposed land (except on foot). Building houses there would put a great strain on the infrastructure, and create greater congestion in an already congested area. More pressure would ensue on local services, such as schools, doctors and social services. Therefore, it would seem a better plan to leave this particular piece of land for what it was intended.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Map 27: Proposed Amendment to BUAB No.4

Reference No. 718

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Cokeham Liberal Democrats

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing in connection with the proposed amendment to the Built Up Area Boundary, as detailed on Map 27, page 147 of the Revise Draft Adur Local Plan 2013.

I wish to object to this proposed amendment to the BUAB and hope that it will be deleted from the final draft of the plan. My reasons for this are:

- 1) The area contains a cemetery. If the land surrounding it is developed, the cemetery's peaceful character will be irretrievably lost.
  - 2) The site has very restricted access to local roads and it will be difficult to create new roads linking to any new houses. This may even put residents in danger if emergency vehicles were unable to gain easy access to the houses.
  - 3) If the site is developed it would be likely to create unacceptably heavy traffic in Upper Boundstone Lane, currently very narrow and with little opportunity to widen.
  - 4) The owners of the houses in Halewick Lane, Meadowview Road, Bramber Close and Steyning Close, which back on to the proposed new BUAB, will lose amenity value if the land is developed.
  - 5) Local residents have informed me that in the past other plans for development in this area have been rejected. This suggests to me that previous objections were accepted as legitimate by the Council, and the grounds for rejecting development there must presumably still be valid.
-



Map/Para/Policy: Map 27: Proposed Amendments to BUAB

Reference No. 970

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Blue Sky Planning

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

Blue Sky Planning Ltd act as planning advisers to Mr Simon Gordon, the freehold owner of a 0.17ha site located to the east of Adur Close, Lancing. The site lies to the north of the A259 and immediately to the east of the existing houses on Adur Close. A plan showing the demise of the site is attached and edged in red.

The purpose of these representations is to object to the sites continued designation as open countryside and Strategic Gap and to demonstrate that there are sound planning reasons why the site should be included within the built up settlement boundary of Lancing.

We consider that the Council should revise the settlement boundary to include the submission site within the Built Up Area Boundary as shown on the attached plan.

Planning Policy Background.

The main planning policy overlap between the Strategic Gap and Green Belt is preventing coalescence of settlements between large built up areas and villages. In this regard the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in March 2012 states that when reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. Paragraph 85 states that when defining boundaries local planning authorities should, inter alia;

- Ensure consistency with the Local Plan Strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development
- Not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open
- Define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent

It is considered that the same principle should apply when local planning authorities are reviewing the built up boundaries around settlements in local plan reviews. In a study undertaken by the DCLG in 2006 in relation to Strategic Gap and green wedge policies it states that in defining Strategic Gaps and other restraint designations it is important to include only land that is strictly necessary to fulfil the purposes of the policy. In addition factors such as openness, topography, the nature of the urban edges and vegetation should be taken into account in defining Strategic Gaps. To this end clearly identifiable logical features should be taken into account in defining long term boundaries which will endure for long term periods.

The NPPF states at paragraph 48 that local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable resource of supply.

Local Characteristics

We consider that there is a shortfall of allocated housing sites to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy and in particular to ensure that the provision of dwellings within the Borough can be achieved. Given that the built up area boundary is tightly drawn around the settlement of Lancing

it is unlikely that further sites could come forward to contribute towards the housing supply.

We set out below the reasons why we consider that the subject site should be considered for residential development and included within the Lancing built up area boundary.

The site is currently designated as part of the countryside and forming part of the strategic gap between Lancing and Shoreham by Sea. However, we consider that the continued designation is unjustified on the basis that the site does not fulfil the objectives and functions of the strategic gap.

We consider that the subject site fulfils the criteria for defining the built up area boundary on the basis that the built up area boundary should generally follow defined physical features such as roads, hedges, field boundaries and existing property lines. It should be noted that the southern boundary of the site is formed by Brighton Road (A259), the northern and eastern boundaries are formed by mature hedges and field boundaries and the western boundary of the site adjoins Adur Close and the adjoining residential properties.

Accordingly we consider that including the subject site within the built up area would essentially “round off” the site to bring it within the built up area boundary.

We note that the Council’s criteria for defining the built up area boundary can include greenfield sites which are predominantly encompassed and are part of the built form and also are defined by strong boundary features. We note that edge of settlement activities that relate well to the built up area should be included within the built up area boundary.

Given the limited size of the site and the fact that it immediately adjoins the built up area boundary adjacent to Adur Close we do not consider that it would have any adverse impact on the long term objectives of the strategic gap.

Given the physical characteristics of the site and its location immediately adjoining the built up area of Lancing we do not consider that including the site within the built up area will impact or infringe upon the views from Lancing College in either direction or have an adverse impact on the long distance views.

It is evident that that the subject site has been landscaped with trees and shrubs which portrays a very different character to the open nature of land to the north and east. It follows that including the site within the built up area boundary will not compromise the long term function of the strategic gap.

It is noted that numbers 8 and 9 Adur Close were subject to two historic planning applications which were refused in the 1970s. However that parcel of land was included within the built up area of the Deposit Draft Local Plan and the two houses were permitted and built in 1994.

Given the close proximity of the subject site to 8-9 Adur Close we are of the view that including the subject site within the built up area boundary will be consistent with the Councils earlier approach.

#### Planning History

Planning permission was refused in April 2005 for 7 two storey, two bedroom affordable terraced houses with 10 parking spaces (including siting and access detail).

Notwithstanding the refusal of planning permission we note that the consultation response from Head of Housing and Strategy & Needs supported the grant of planning permission subject to a Section 106 agreement to ensure, amongst other things, that the whole of the site is transferred to Affinity Housing Association (or another registered social landlord to be agreed by the Council) for affordable housing in perpetuity.

The Head of Housing and Strategy stated that the need for affordable housing of all types remains high, as indicated in the housing needs survey and furthermore that the application site was a prime candidate to fall within Policy AH4 of the Local Plan as an “exception” to the strategic gap policy.

The Committee report recognises that there is clearly a need for affordable housing in the district and in Sussex as a whole and that the applicant had addressed previous concerns about the lack of information as to how the proposed housing would be made affordable.

In February 2012 a Lawful Development Certificate was granted for the proposed erection of a part 1.5m and part 1m high boundary fence which could effectively enclose the site and separate it further from functioning as part of the Strategic Gap.

### Summary

It is considered that due to the small size of the site coupled with its physical characteristics that including it within the built up area of Lancing would not lead towards further coalescence between Lancing and Shoreham by Sea. Furthermore the subject site is not located in a prominent position and would not have a significant adverse effect on the value of the strategic gap.

It is considered that due to the existing site characteristics and its location immediately adjoining the existing built up area boundary it is suggested that the site can be “squared off” and the proposed settlement boundary for Lancing should include the subject site.

The site is well related to existing residential areas and adjoins existing housing development, it is therefore considered suitable as a future housing site. The site is available and does not have any constraints which would prevent taking place

The subject site forms an isolated pocket of the Strategic Gap unrelated to the wider designation. The site could accommodate limited development whilst ensuring the retention of the Strategic Gap and without harming the function and integrity of the Strategic Gap.

We can confirm that there are no constraints in terms of ownership, availability, or access that would prevent the site being delivered for residential development.

The Council’s draft Adur Local Plan background evidence document confirms that development in Adur is likely to be restricted by the availability of land and release of the subject site would assist in bringing forward a “windfall” site to contribute to the Council’s housing land supply.

In summary the inclusion of the site within the built up settlement boundary for Lancing would create more opportunities for residential development, particularly affordable housing.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.1**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.1

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the publication of the pre-submission version of the Adur Local Plan which, when adopted, will provide an up-to-date planning policy framework for the district of Adur outside the South Downs National Park.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.13**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.13

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

SDNPA plan in due course but will that be available to all for comment and also run to 2031 or further.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.13

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references in paragraph 1.13 to the physical extent of the plan area not extending into the South Downs National Park and in Map 2. However, SDNPA suggests that the boundary of the plan area is made clearer on the Map so that the reader can be left in no doubt the area that the plan covers.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.19**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.19

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Regarding soundness of plan and those able to comment, can you clarify whether it will be council, MPs and general public who have raised objections. Or only limited to Adur Council.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.20**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.20

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

**Introduction**

1.20: The West Sussex Waste Local Plan (as modified October 2013) requires, through Policy W2, the safeguarding of existing waste sites / infrastructure from other (non-waste) development which may prevent or prejudice their continued operation for such purposes. This policy also applies to sites allocated in the West Sussex WLP (as modified October 2013). The Minerals Local Plan requires that existing minerals sites, minerals infrastructure and allocated sites be safeguarded from other (non-minerals) development which may prevent or prejudice their continued operation for such purposes. The implementation of these Waste and Minerals Local Plan safeguarding policies requires cooperation between the County Council and the Districts and Borough Councils. Applications for any development at, adjacent or proximal to existing waste or mineral sites / infrastructure should be the subject of consultation with the County Council. Guidance on the approach to safeguarding waste capacity will be provided in due course (following the likely adoption of the Waste Plan in 2014). Commitment to identifying safeguarded minerals and waste infrastructure and sites as identified by the West Sussex WLP (as modified October 2013) and emerging Minerals Local Plan is welcomed. The County Council can provide data relating to these sites in GIS format to assist Adur DC in preparing the Policies Map.

The County Council will, through the future Minerals Local Plan, set out the formal Minerals Safeguarding. MSAs will be defined based on the evidence set out within the Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas for West Sussex Report (British Geological Society, 2007). Until the new Minerals Plan is prepared it may not be prudent to include the extent of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas on the ADC Local Plan Policies Map. However, it is necessary to refer to the principle of mineral safeguarding, the purpose of MSAs and reference to likely extent within the ADC Local Plan. This will ensure that Minerals are not sterilised by non-mineral developments and encourage the potential need for prior extraction. The County Council need not dictate specific wording of a reference to MSAs, but can provide further assistance if required.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.24 - 1.30**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.24 - 1.30

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the on-going duty to co-operate partnership working with Adur District Council, and other coastal Sussex authorities, through the Coastal West Sussex Strategic Planning Board, and officer group, and through the Duty to Co-Operate Housing Report, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. The National Park Authority also welcomes the proposed meeting of Members and officers of the Authorities to discuss issues arising through the Adur Local Plan.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.26**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.26

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Duty to Co-operate

1.26: Please omit 'Strategy' and replace with 'Statement'.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

1. City Deal should be referenced in this context.
2. Understated - dependence on improved infrastructure is critical point
7. Timing of road improvements not stated (they are overdue)
8. Tidal walls along river are needed before 2017 to release development land and gain investor confidence
9. The City Deal Shoreham hub is focused on this and the point is ignored



Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 07

Reference No. 973

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sustrans

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### KEY ISSUE 7 (p13)

The need to address road congestion and related pollution – air and noise – whilst improving the existing transport network.

The Active Travel Strategy from the Department of Health and Department for Transport (February 2010) argued that putting walking and cycling at the heart of local transport and public health strategies will improve public health, tackle congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve the local environment.

The vision, objectives, and policies do not place sustainable transport at the heart of the Adur Local Plan. The overall impression is that sustainable transport is regarded as a mitigation measure to manage increasing levels of congestion and air pollution.

Long-term, strategic investment in sustainable modes of transport has the potential to deliver against a far greater range the ALP's objectives.

Moreover, using the Government's own methods of assessing the economic benefits of transport schemes, Sustrans has shown that local walking and cycling schemes have a benefit to cost ratio of 20:1. In times of severe budget restrictions this sits in stark contrast to the typical ratio of just 3:1 for other transport schemes such as rail and roads.

The comments that follow illustrate these points.

#### Waves Ahead – The Sustainable Community Strategy (1.38: p14)

Investment in measures that would make walking and cycling an attractive travel choice would contribute to all the objectives of the 'Waves Ahead' sustainable community strategy:

The health and well-being of active travel;

The social inclusion that comes with making walking and cycling a safe and affordable travel choice for people of all ages and abilities;

The economic benefits of reducing congestion;

The environmental benefits that would help to make Adur a better place to live.

Active, sustainable transport needs to be at the heart of the Adur Local Plan if this potential is to be realised. A clear strategic vision is critically important and Sustrans would like to see this recognised in the vision and objectives of the ALP.

In the current environment funding comes from a variety of sources and decision making is devolved to a number of different bodies. Without strategic direction and commitment, there is a high risk that spending on sustainable transport is piecemeal; schemes are not planned in a joined-up way; and value-for-money is not achieved and benefits to the community are not realised.

#### Travel Behaviour Change Programmes (Appendix RD10)

Travel behaviour change (TBC) programmes (p217) could be run across the whole of Adur to meet an objective of modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. It is not clear what evidence supports the statement that travel behaviour change programmes "have the greatest impact... within and around the development sites" (p217). Placed in this Appendix, it would appear that TBC programmes are viewed purely as a mitigation measure to help manage increasing levels of congestion. This sells short the potential benefits and value for money that might be achieved. Significant benefits against a wider range of objectives might be achieved by running TBC programmes within existing urban areas across Adur.

#### Junction Improvements (Appendix RD10)

"Highway mitigation schemes are required for nine of thirteen key junctions" (p217). By managing congestion at these points, road transport becomes a more attractive option. No evidence is presented to show that the congestion (and associated problems such as air pollution) is not shifted to other points on the road network. Sustrans would like to see:

A cost-benefit analysis comparing the value of these highway mitigation schemes against investment in sustainable modes of transport.

An assessment of ALP objectives that are met by the highway mitigation schemes compared to investment in sustainable modes of transport.

The observation is made that in West Sussex a number of highway mitigation schemes, while managing greater volumes of traffic, have been detrimental to cycling.

#### Strategic Cycle Routes

While specific junctions have been identified for mitigation measures (Appendix RD10) and 'proposed roundabout options' drawn up (Map 7, p54), measures to improve sustainable modes of transport are mostly generalised statements of intent with caveats such as "where feasible".

Sustrans would like to see included in the Adur Local Plan a commitment to develop high quality cycle routes in two key areas to improve access into and out of Shoreham. This would be consistent with other policies in the Adur Local Plan: Revised Draft Policy 13 (p92): "Improvements to green infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle links, will be supported". Revised Draft Policy 26: The Visitor Economy (p121). "Access (including new footpaths, cycleways and slipways) to the river, the coast and the South Downs National Park should be improved where possible". Shoreham Harbour Regeneration (p63): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path that links the new Adur Ferry Bridge with Southwick Locks, suitable for both leisure and utility cyclists. This would become the new alignment of National Cycle Network Route 2, rather than the existing inland route.

Shoreham Airport (p51): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path between North Lancing and the Adur Tollbridge. An improved cycle and walking crossing of the A27 to link the Old Shoreham Road and Coombes Road to provide access to Lancing College, the South Downs National Park and Steyning. A signed cycle route through the Airport linking the Downslink Path at the Adur Tollbridge to National Cycle Network Route 2 east of Widewater Lagoon.

The proposed roundabout changes at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm (p54) should be designed with high-quality cycle routes as part of the brief. The designs presented in Map 7 (p54) would appear to be designed to manage increased traffic levels. Designs that also make cycling a more attractive travel choice would also help to manage the levels of traffic.

#### Cycling in Urban Areas

Sustrans would like to see a policy commitment in the Adur Local Plan to make urban areas more attractive to cycling so that a bike ride is a safe, quick and affordable travel choice for trips to local amenities. This might include:

Designating or upgrading suitable footpaths as shared-use space, such as the existing link between Nicolson Drive and Middle Road in Shoreham.

Introducing cycling contraflows on one-way streets, such as in East Street, Shoreham.

Reducing speed limits on all residential roads to 20mph.

In the same way that specific road junctions have been identified, mitigation measures could be identified to remove barriers to access on foot or by bike to important destinations, such as schools, health centres, railway stations, and shops.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 08**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 08

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

You only speak of River Adur, what about the other tributary's i.e Teville Stream. Please see 2009 report <http://www.wavesahead.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/TevilleScopingStudy.pdf>

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 10**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 10

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Key Issues for the Local Plan

10. The need to improve health and wellbeing

Strongly support 'access to open spaces and countryside must be maintained and improved where possible', which should apply to all users.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 11**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issue 11

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Number 11 refers to "the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the built, historic and natural environment". This would be an appropriate place to introduce the important statutory duty placed on the council by Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995 to have regard to the designation of the national park.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issues**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.32: Key Issues

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Key Issues for the Local Plan

Key Issue 8: It is suggested that reference to the constrained nature of the potential development areas is included and it is stated that most potential areas are within Flood Risk Zones – Sequential / Exemption Test etc. i.e. to demonstrate that the least worst options with respect to Flood Risk are being examined.

It should be noted that climate change will likely worsen all levels of flood risk and so development choice and design is key.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.35-1.36**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.35-1.36

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

This section refers inter alia to the NPPF which includes various strong policies relevant to the protection and enhancement of the national park. As the plan will be expected to demonstrate how it complies with government policy, it would be appropriate here to highlight the plan's commitment to meeting its Section 62 duty.

---



Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.38

Reference No. 973

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sustrans

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### KEY ISSUE 7 (p13)

The need to address road congestion and related pollution – air and noise – whilst improving the existing transport network.

The Active Travel Strategy from the Department of Health and Department for Transport (February 2010) argued that putting walking and cycling at the heart of local transport and public health strategies will improve public health, tackle congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve the local environment.

The vision, objectives, and policies do not place sustainable transport at the heart of the Adur Local Plan. The overall impression is that sustainable transport is regarded as a mitigation measure to manage increasing levels of congestion and air pollution. Long-term, strategic investment in sustainable modes of transport has the potential to deliver against a far greater range the ALP's objectives. Moreover, using the Government's own methods of assessing the economic benefits of transport schemes, Sustrans has shown that local walking and cycling schemes have a benefit to cost ratio of 20:1. In times of severe budget restrictions this sits in stark contrast to the typical ratio of just 3:1 for other transport schemes such as rail and roads.

The comments that follow illustrate these points.

Waves Ahead – The Sustainable Community Strategy (1.38: p14)

Investment in measures that would make walking and cycling an attractive travel choice would contribute to all the objectives of the 'Waves Ahead' sustainable community strategy:

The health and well-being of active travel;

The social inclusion that comes with making walking and cycling a safe and affordable travel choice for people of all ages and abilities;

The economic benefits of reducing congestion;

The environmental benefits that would help to make Adur a better place to live.

Active, sustainable transport needs to be at the heart of the Adur Local Plan if this potential is to be realised. A clear strategic vision is critically important and Sustrans would like to see this recognised in the vision and objectives of the ALP.

In the current environment funding comes from a variety of sources and decision making is devolved to a number of different bodies. Without strategic direction and commitment, there is a high risk that spending on sustainable transport is piecemeal; schemes are not planned in a joined-up way; and value-for-money is not achieved and benefits to the community are not realised.

Travel Behaviour Change Programmes (Appendix RD10)

Travel behaviour change (TBC) programmes (p217) could be run across the whole of Adur to meet an objective of modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. It is not clear what evidence supports the statement that travel behaviour change programmes "have the greatest impact... within and around the development sites" (p217). Placed in this Appendix, it would appear that TBC programmes are viewed purely as a mitigation measure to help manage increasing levels of congestion. This sells short the potential benefits and value for money that might be achieved. Significant benefits against a wider range of objectives might be achieved by running TBC programmes within existing urban areas across Adur.

Junction Improvements (Appendix RD10)

"Highway mitigation schemes are required for nine of thirteen key junctions" (p217). By managing congestion at these points, road transport becomes a more attractive option. No evidence is presented to show that the congestion (and associated problems such as air pollution) is not shifted to other points on the road network. Sustrans would like to see:

A cost-benefit analysis comparing the value of these highway mitigation schemes against investment in sustainable modes of transport.

An assessment of ALP objectives that are met by the highway mitigation schemes compared to investment in sustainable modes of transport.

The observation is made that in West Sussex a number of highway mitigation schemes, while managing greater volumes of traffic, have been detrimental to cycling.

#### Strategic Cycle Routes

While specific junctions have been identified for mitigation measures (Appendix RD10) and 'proposed roundabout options' drawn up (Map 7, p54), measures to improve sustainable modes of transport are mostly generalised statements of intent with caveats such as "where feasible".

Sustrans would like to see included in the Adur Local Plan a commitment to develop high quality cycle routes in two key areas to improve access into and out of Shoreham. This would be consistent with other policies in the Adur Local Plan: Revised Draft Policy 13 (p92): "Improvements to green infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle links, will be supported". Revised Draft Policy 26: The Visitor Economy (p121). "Access (including new footpaths, cycleways and slipways) to the river, the coast and the South Downs National Park should be improved where possible". Shoreham Harbour Regeneration (p63): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path that links the new Adur Ferry Bridge with Southwick Locks, suitable for both leisure and utility cyclists. This would become the new alignment of National Cycle Network Route 2, rather than the existing inland route.

Shoreham Airport (p51): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path between North Lancing and the Adur Tollbridge. An improved cycle and walking crossing of the A27 to link the Old Shoreham Road and Coombes Road to provide access to Lancing College, the South Downs National Park and Steyning. A signed cycle route through the Airport linking the Downslink Path at the Adur Tollbridge to National Cycle Network Route 2 east of Widewater Lagoon.

The proposed roundabout changes at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm (p54) should be designed with high-quality cycle routes as part of the brief. The designs presented in Map 7 (p54) would appear to be designed to manage increased traffic levels. Designs that also make cycling a more attractive travel choice would also help to manage the levels of traffic.

#### Cycling in Urban Areas

Sustrans would like to see a policy commitment in the Adur Local Plan to make urban areas more attractive to cycling so that a bike ride is a safe, quick and affordable travel choice for trips to local amenities. This might include:

Designating or upgrading suitable footpaths as shared-use space, such as the existing link between Nicolson Drive and Middle Road in Shoreham.

Introducing cycling contraflows on one-way streets, such as in East Street, Shoreham.

Reducing speed limits on all residential roads to 20mph.

In the same way that specific road junctions have been identified, mitigation measures could be identified to remove barriers to access on foot or by bike to important destinations, such as schools, health centres, railway stations, and shops.

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.38

Reference No. 969

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Northbrook College

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1.38.

Given the LSP priority of 'Learning, training and employment opportunities for all' it would be good to see an objective for Adur which said something about how the first two points might be better achieved working with schools, academies, Northbrook College and University partners.

This could become acute once the house building outlined in the plan is realised and it is unclear whether West Sussex will be in a position to support the building of any new schools in the future without central government funds. Our experience is that s106 contributions are exactly that and do not meet the costs of building a new school

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 01**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 01

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Number of dwellings, how many could be found from empty or even modified current houses.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 03 b)**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 03 b)

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

If you are building houses on the fringe boundary how can you extend the airport to fill this point?

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 03 c)**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 03 c)

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I understand that New Monks Farm is a flood plain and already in last 2-5 years been underwater so how can you justify building.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 06**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 06

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Objective O6 (“Public access to the national park will be improved”) and O7 (“Protect and improve the setting of the South Downs National Park”) are supported. This commitment should also be reflected at the Key Issues, National Policy and Vision stages – see above.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 06

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes references in Objective 6 to a Green Infrastructure Strategy and to improvements in public access to the National Park.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 06

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Objective 6 is supported - especially the provision of greater opportunities for informal recreational uses within the Local Green Gaps and better access to the South Downs National Park (SDNP).

---

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 06

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Strongly support, especially welcome the wording 'greater opportunities for (and access to) informal recreational uses within the Local Green Gaps. Public access to the National Park and other countryside assets will be improved.' Informal recreation for all users (walkers, cyclists, equestrians) using the prowl network, is the principal means to access the countryside.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 06

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

There are already Green Gaps within these boundaries. But you are now proposing to build on them.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 07**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 07

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

<http://www.wavesahead.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/TevilleScopingStudy.pdf>

and also the Rampion windfarm\* corridor to Bolney will be going over the areas of conservation.

(\*Aware with Planning Inspectorate, Bristol)

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 07

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 07

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Objective O6 (“Public access to the national park will be improved”) and O7 (“Protect and improve the setting of the South Downs National Park”) are supported. This commitment should also be reflected at the Key Issues, National Policy and Vision stages – see above.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 09**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 09

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The public transport at the moment has been severely cut and if you wish to leave Sompting Village at night it is impossible after 7pm unless by own vehicles.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 10**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 10

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

A27 has been on-going for many years and when they had the option to improve it was pulled.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 11**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Objective 11

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Please see attached plans for flooding and groundwater taken from environment agency plans.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 02**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 02

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Some of the planned building is on leisure facility i.e. grassland for equines and those that ride. Which means they will have to find accommodation further than at moment and not be able to ride within this countryside area.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 03**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 03

Reference No. 840

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Cemex UK Properties Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Deloitte Real Estate

SEE EMAIL ATTACHMENTS FOR LETTER.

Vision 3 states that 'through new development at Shoreham Harbour, new opportunities for employment will have been created to benefit the economic prosperity of Adur as well as the wider sub-region.' CEMEX welcomes this initiative and considers it to accord with NPPF Paragraph 14.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 04**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 04

Reference No. 840

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Cemex UK Properties Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Deloitte Real Estate

SEE EMAIL ATTACHMENTS FOR LETTER.

Vision 4 states that 'much of the regeneration of Shoreham Harbour will have been delivered, achieving a mix of residential, employment, community, education, leisure and retail development, affordable housing, and new employment opportunities. The regeneration work will also have provided an opportunity for consolidating, reconfiguring and enhancing activities of the Port of Shoreham, which will continue to play a vital role in the local economy. Relocation of some commercial uses will have resulted in a more attractive urban environment and an improved interface between the Harbour and the rest of Adur'.

Vision 11 states that development which meets the economic, social and environmental objectives of this plan will have been supported. The plan will aim to regenerate Adur through ensuring a range of employment opportunities and through new sustainable development opportunities. In particular, regeneration will seek to '(a) Achieve strategic development at Shoreham Harbour, delivering housing and jobs; creating social, economic, environmental and infrastructure improvements which benefit Adur, its businesses, residents and visitors and contribute to the prosperity of the wider sub-region'.

CEMEX understands the objectives of Vision 4 and 11 of introducing mixed use development to Shoreham Harbour and consider this strategy to be in accordance with Paragraph 17 of the NPPF, however CEMEX urges the Council to ensure that existing and viable wharf uses in the area are safeguarded. This is in accordance with Paragraph 143 bullet point 4 of the NPPF, which states that in preparing Local Plans, Local Authorities should safeguard 'existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport by rail, sea or inland waterways of minerals, including recycled, secondary and marine-dredged materials' and 'existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material.

The CEMEX site is an operational site and provides wharf facilities essential for the supply of aggregates to Sussex and across the South East. CEMEX anticipate that it will continue to be used for the foreseeable future. Allowing new development to prejudice the existing business in the area would not constitute 'supporting existing business' and would therefore be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 21, bullet point 3.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 07**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 07

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 07

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Vision V7 includes the words “Important views will have been protected” and “Opportunities will be taken to capitalise on Adur’s location adjacent to the South Downs National Park”. Both are worthy sentiments but could be improved by recognising that the views to be protected must include those from the national park across Adur towards the south. The location is not only something to be “capitalised on”: it imposes a duty

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 07

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Vision 7 is supported - we welcome the commitment to improving public access to the countryside and coast.

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 08**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 08

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Catch 22 build houses, more cars, more congestion on car parked road (various times of day) for A27 also coast road. Plus with rising seas how long before coast road underwater.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 09**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 09

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Plus with rising seas how long before coast road underwater.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 11**

Map/Para/Policy: Para 1.40: Vision 11

Reference No. 840

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Cemex UK Properties Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Deloitte Real Estate

SEE EMAIL ATTACHMENTS FOR LETTER

Vision 4 states that 'much of the regeneration of Shoreham Harbour will have been delivered, achieving a mix of residential, employment, community, education, leisure and retail development, affordable housing, and new employment opportunities. The regeneration work will also have provided an opportunity for consolidating, reconfiguring and enhancing activities of the Port of Shoreham, which will continue to play a vital role in the local economy. Relocation of some commercial uses will have resulted in a more attractive urban environment and an improved interface between the Harbour and the rest of Adur'.

Vision 11 states that development which meets the economic, social and environmental objectives of this plan will have been supported. The plan will aim to regenerate Adur through ensuring a range of employment opportunities and through new sustainable development opportunities. In particular, regeneration will seek to '(a) Achieve strategic development at Shoreham Harbour, delivering housing and jobs; creating social, economic, environmental and infrastructure improvements which benefit Adur, its businesses, residents and visitors and contribute to the prosperity of the wider sub-region'.

CEMEX understands the objectives of Vision 4 and 11 of introducing mixed use development to Shoreham Harbour and consider this strategy to be in accordance with Paragraph 17 of the NPPF, however CEMEX urges the Council to ensure that existing and viable wharf uses in the area are safeguarded. This is in accordance with Paragraph 143 bullet point 4 of the NPPF, which states that in preparing Local Plans, Local Authorities should safeguard 'existing, planned and potential rail heads, rail links to quarries, wharfage and associated storage, handling and processing facilities for the bulk transport by rail, sea or inland waterways of minerals, including recycled, secondary and marine-dredged materials' and 'existing, planned and potential sites for concrete batching, the manufacture of coated materials, other concrete products and the handling, processing and distribution of substitute, recycled and secondary aggregate material.

The CEMEX site is an operational site and provides wharf facilities essential for the supply of aggregates to Sussex and across the South East. CEMEX anticipate that it will continue to be used for the foreseeable future. Allowing new development to prejudice the existing business in the area would not constitute 'supporting existing business' and would therefore be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 21, bullet point 3.

**Map/Para/Policy: Part 1: The Adur Local Plan**

Map/Para/Policy: Part 1: The Adur Local Plan

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The Sussex Wildlife Trust is pleased to see the broad level of cross boundary working that has been undertaken as part of the district council's duty to cooperate. We would like to use this opportunity to raise the importance of cross boundary working when determining the soundness of the Local Plan. Section 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states "...local planning authorities should work collaboratively on strategic planning priorities to enable delivery of sustainable development in consultation with the Local Enterprise Partnership and Local Nature Partnership..."

We have not been able to see how Adur District Council has consulted with the Sussex Local Nature Partnership. We would encourage dialogue with this partnership as it could help to ensure that nature conservation and biodiversity is fully considered in the Local Plan.

The plan sets out 11 vision statements. We are disappointed to see a lack of environmental vision for the biodiversity of the district. We would seek for this section to contain a vision statement that clearly sets out the district's need to make certain that there is an increase in natural capital to ensure that growth is sustainable.

The objectives within the plan make reference to opportunities to seek environmental enhancements. The Sussex Wildlife Trust is pleased to see the recognition of the environment within objective 4 and hope that this acknowledgement of environmental infrastructure will ensure that growth in natural capital is considered throughout the plan. Objective 6 offers opportunities for the council to include wording that highlights their commitment to ensure cross boundary working in this area, thus ensuring connectivity for green infrastructure both within the boundaries of the district and with adjoining authorities.

'To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity planning policies should plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries' NPPF Section 17.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity**

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity

Reference No. 1018

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I write to voice concerns regarding the Site Allocations (Part 2 of the Plan):

New Monks Farm and West Sompting site have huge negative impact upon the already overloaded A27.

Shoreham Airport development impinges upon the River (SSSI) and linked habitat. The site allocated is a feeding ground for birds, particularly Lapwings - a species of conservation concern as they are losing suitable habitats. This allocation would further reduce their habitat.

I do wonder what potential there is for developing brownfield sites such as the old Cement Works and land on the opposite side of the road from the old Cement works? These are eyesores on land abutting the South Downs National Park. Green views from the National park would be eroded by all the proposed site allocations.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.03

Objections to the exclusion of the Steyning Road site (Land between Steyning Road and the river Adur) size: 2.48 hectares, from the strategic land allocation

a. The UFS suggests a high quality employment use may be appropriate in such a 'key gateway site' and that it 'would function well as an employment area'. The ELR failed to include this site, as previously identified, within its scope of consideration. The ELR concludes that 'the quality of sites assessed [within its report] is sub-standard', and that 'there is a need to identify additional high quality sites to meet market demand'. The Steyning Road site is one such site, which should be included within the Revised Draft Local Plan.

b. The LES concluded the site has a 'medium-low' impact for overall visual sensitivity and The UFS assessed the site as having a 'low contribution to the landscape' and 'low importance to the strategic gap. This is the lowest rating of all the sites assessed. (See Appendix B – Sites Comparison Table) The site is cut off from the gap by the natural boundary of the river Adur to its west and the Ricardo industrial site and described in the UFS as having 'tenuous visual relationship' with the rest of the gap. The site is cut off from the gap by the natural boundary of the river Adur to its west and the Ricardo industrial site. The exclusion of this site from the green gap using the physical features of the River Adur to define a recognisable and permanent boundary line would be consistent with NPPF paragraph 85, with regard to protecting the local green gaps. The site has a 'relatively enclosed character' (Landscape & Ecology Study p.19) due to the steep slopes of the cuttings surrounding the junction to the north and east, the dominant structure of the raised junction itself and the raised flood embankment topped with vegetation to the west. Therefore, the affected landscape viewpoints referred to within the L&ES and the Revised DLP are erroneous and misleading, as the Steyning Road site cannot be seen from any of the views suggested other than by "low sensitivity viewers" from the A27 flyover itself, when travelling at speed and the A283 where it runs along the side of the site. (See Appendix G – Landscape Views)

c. The UFS graded the agricultural land quality and environmental impact as both 'low'. (See Appendix B – Sites Comparison Table) Therefore, inclusion of this land in the Local Plan's strategic site allocation would be consistent with NPPF where plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value (Chapter 11, Conserving and enhancing the natural environment, paragraph 110).

d. The site is not reliant on significant transport infrastructure and consistent with the NPPF Chapter 4. 'Promoting sustainable transport' in that it can demonstrate the need to travel can be minimised by the use of sustainable transport modes, due to its location beside the existing bus route along Steyning Road. The site is also immediately bounded to its west by a national cycle route and footpath that connects with the town centre. The town centre and railway station are both located 1.3km away. (See Appendix B – Sites Comparison Table)

e. Site Access – the site adjoins the Steyning Road. Minimal work would be required in widening the road to provide a vehicle waiting lane for turning and for the 30mph limit to be moved closer to the A27 roundabout junction. The Employment Land Review 2011 (conclusions 7.20) identified the need for sites with good and immediate access to the A27 trunk road: 'The accessibility of the current portfolio of sites to the strategic road network is a key concern. Thought needs to be given to the allocation of land close to and with good access from the A27 in particular, to support the local economy' – The Steyning Road site is ideally located just to the south of the A27/A283 interchange.

f. The site is currently located mostly in Flood Zone 3a, with a small area in 3b. (See Appendix H – Flood Risk Assessment) The Environment Agency has indicated there is potential to influence the preferred option to their TWS in this reach of the river, to afford greater protection of this site subject to certain conditions being met. (See Appendix F – Environment Agency Letter) This includes delivery of wider opportunities and benefits where possible. Such opportunities and benefits could be provided by a scheme that protects the A27 roundabout junction and the Steyning Road leading into the town centre by providing flood protection of 1/200 years. Given that the Revised DLP has highlighted the scarcity of unconstrained land for development within the District as a whole and that it is not able to meet its own objectively assessed housing needs target, it seems of paramount importance to safeguard this site for future development.

g. Development of this site would be consistent with the NPPF on sustainable development bringing economic, social and environmental benefits to the district.

Economic:

i. The Adur Employment Land Review 2011 noted that the supply of land and premises for employment in the district is very constrained and on the whole of relatively poor quality. The Shoreham Gateway site was identified by the UFS as land that would function well as an employment area and that it would be suitable for development for high quality employment use.

ii. Development at this site would be consistent with NPPF (chapter 2, 'Ensuring the vitality of town centres, paragraph 23) for allocation of appropriate edge of centre sites for main town centre uses that are well connected to the town centre where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available, and if sufficient edge of centre sites cannot be identified, set policies for meeting the identified needs in other accessible locations that are well connected to the town centre.

Social:

iii. Supporting the community by providing economic benefits and/or housing needs.

iv. Development of the site could provide better access to the river embankment and the open spaces of the green gap, National Park and coast by linking to the existing cycle way and footpath.

Environmental:

v. The site could contribute to the costs of building the TWS and improvements to the A27/A283 roundabout.

vi. Extended TWS could provide more salt marsh along the river embankment.

vii. Accessible location linked to the town centre by footpath and cycle way; close to the railway station and the main trunk road of the A27; served by existing bus route into Shoreham along Steyning Road.

h. NPPF chapter 6 – 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes', (paragraph 47) local authorities should 'identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. This site is more deliverable and relatively unconstrained when compared to the preferred Revised DLP site allocations.

i. This site is no more constrained by traffic noise pollution associated with the A27 and A283 than proposed site allocations at Sompting, New Monks Farm and Shoreham Harbour. All such sites would be subject to noise impact studies and mitigation through design. In each of these cases it is prepared to accept that site design and layout can be used to mitigate against the impacts of noise. Therefore, the Steyning Road site should not be excluded from the strategic site allocation for housing on the basis of noise where similar measures could be used.

2.04

Objection to the exclusion of other sites

a. List of other sites, identified in the Urban Fringe Study 2006, which have been overlooked. (This list is not exclusive or exhaustive.)

i. Land on Mill Hill, north of The Street, Shoreham (size 5.8 hectares) – suitable for housing.

This site was identified by the UFS as being unconstrained by the following factors:

1. The site is within a low category for flood risk
2. Extension of housing here would 'round off ' the settlement pattern
3. Accessibility is good, being close the town centre and to an existing bus route. Local services include a school.
4. Site could yield 232 dwellings based on medium density (40dph).
5. The site bears little relationship with the green gap.

li. Land north of Firlie Road, North Lancing (size 2.5 hectares) – suitable for housing

This site was identified by the UFS as being unconstrained by the following factors:

1. The site is within a low flood risk category.
2. Land assessed in the UFS as having 'low' agricultural land quality.
3. Within 400m of bus route and within acceptable distance of schools

4. UFS concludes the site is capable of accommodating development and would be best suited to low density of housing (30dph) yielding around 75 new dwellings

5. Not located within the strategic gap

b. These sites, as identified in the UFS, were all rated with a higher degree of potential for development than other sites that the Revised DLP currently proposes for Strategic Land Allocation. However, this representation leaves it for the owners of these sites to promote their value to the Local Authority.

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We welcome recognition within the revised plan that meeting the housing demand calculated within the LGHNS would severely impact on the green spaces and biodiversity of the district. We are encouraged that as a result you have subsequent revised house numbers down. However we are concerned that that the proposed housing numbers are still higher than the preferred option A of 2736. We would like to highlight to Adur District Council that the allocation of strategic areas for development and strategic delivery policies should always be informed by data related to the functioning of ecological networks at a landscape scale and underpinned by up to date, site specific data. This would be in line with the guidance within the NPPF:

'Set out a strategic approach in their Local plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.' section 114 'Planning policies and decisions should be based on up-to-date information about the natural environment and other characteristics of the area...' section 165.

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity

Reference No. 44

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The area between Shoreham-by-Sea and Worthing is unique as it is an extremely thin piece of land between the downs and the sea. There are only two roads A259 & A27 east to west. Both these roads are already stretched to capacity. Those two roads simply cannot take any more traffic. When the only two roads east & west get blocked the whole area is affected and disrupted. Building on flood plain is simply insane. This will only lead to further environmental problems. The proposed area on the A27 is where the planes depart and arrive from and to Shoreham airport. Planes have already crashed in this area.

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity Reference No. 90  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

The area cannot sustain extra housing and businesses: -

- The roads are already too congested (A27 & A259) and grid locked at same time most days. Adding extra vehicles and junctions on top of the projected increase would be intolerable.
  - Much of the new housing is designated for land which was marsh land. Draining this would be impossible and endanger existing housing.
  - Ironically 'Defra' designate the area as under 'water stress' and we regularly have water rationing.
  - The developments would take away much of the remaining green space in the area and change the character which the residents enjoy.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity Reference No. 40  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

No one in their right mind would do anything to increase traffic on the A27.

Ask the police just how many man hours they use to keep on trying to organise the complete foul ups of the A27. The road is an accident Black spot already. To make it worse is absolute lunacy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Part 2: A Strategy for Change and Prosperity Reference No. 51  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation c/o Shoreham Society  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Could we have details of traffic flow on the A270, A259 inward & outward i.e. numbers of vehicles from 7am to 7pm (12 hours period) so we can access what affect this/these developments will have on congestion/pollution/quality of life etc.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 01: Sustainable Development**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 01: Sustainable Development

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are not convinced that the presumption is evident in the reduction in employment land allocation

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 01: The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 01: The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Reference No. 941

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Landstone Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation ECE Planning

Overall it is considered that the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 fails to reflect or comply with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. The failure of the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework stems primarily from the Council not positively or proactively planning to meet the locally identified housing need as indicated in the Locally Generated Housing Needs Survey (LGHNS).

The failure of the Local Plan to meet the identified housing need has been further compounded by the Council's unjustified decision not to allocate the land at Hasler for residential development despite, the significant flood alleviation works to be undertaken as part of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Scheme or, the requirement within the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities to plan for development in areas which can be developed through use of suitable adaptation measures.

Our client is keen to proactively and positively explore the residential development of the land at Hasler and discuss solution to overcome the remaining physical constraints.

We therefore hope that Adur District Council will reconsider their housing needs position and decision not to allocate the land at Hasler for residential development and engage proactively and positively in bringing the site forward to meet the locally identified housing need arising in the District.

If you have any further queries or require further information please contact me on 01903 248777.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 01: The Presumption in Favour of Sustainabl

Reference No. 1061

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Liberal Democrats

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am very concerned that the wording of this policy is so loose that it will leave future councils with too little discretion in making decisions on future planning applications. Although I agree that the Adur District needs sustainable development in the future, I believe the way this policy is worded shifts the balance of power away from local people and towards property developers.

Specifically, although the policy speaks of always working 'proactively with applicants' to find solutions to their planning applications, it makes no mention of taking account of local residents' views on specific applications. In fact, it seems to me that the wording is designed to exclude, or at the very least, minimise the influence local residents have over future planning decisions, a position which I believe is totally unacceptable.

I believe the second sentence of the first paragraph should be redrafted as follows: "It will work jointly with applicants and local residents to find solutions which mean that applications can be approved on the basis that they secure development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District and meet the reasonable concerns of affected local residents."

I believe the second paragraph should be redrafted as follows: "Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in Neighbourhood Plans) will be approved (if necessary with amendments) after proper consultation with affected communities, unless material considerations indicate otherwise." I should add that my suggested wording of the second paragraph is not intended to imply that I agree with all the policies in the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan.

I am also concerned about the drafting of the third paragraph, specifically the suggestion that applications not covered by the Adur Local Plan or relevant policies should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. I believe the paragraph should be redrafted to make it clear that major applications which fall into this category will be first sent for consultation with relevant local communities before being considered by the Planning Committee. In general, I believe wording which suggests that planning applications will be approved 'unless' certain factors are in play is too loose for the Adur Local Plan. It could create a situation where the Council has difficulty in declining an unacceptable application in the future.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 01: The Presumption in Favour of Sustainabl

Reference No. 941

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Landstone Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation ECE Planning

Draft Policy 1 should therefore be amended to include limited release of land within Flood Zone 3a with particular reference to land at Hasler (Old Salts Farm) as shown on the attached plan.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.5**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.5

Reference No. 15

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

There is a very high risk of flooding from groundwater and surface water already. The land in question is flood plain and efficiently absorbs and disperses rain and high groundwater flows. Building on that land could cause flooding of Hasler's existing homes. Please refer to winter 2012/13 for local photographs.

Building 100s of homes with no access except through Hasler's narrow roads and then on to the A259 (which already sees crawling traffic queues to east and west) would be totally irresponsible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.5

Reference No. 740

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This was a good decision to remove West Beach from your Plan. We need our 'flood plain'. The exit on to the A259 could not cope with extra traffic.

Well done for seeing sense.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.5

Reference No. 746

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am pleased that you are not building on the old Salts land due to flooding. Well done planners for understanding the problems here.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.5

Reference No. 5

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The exclusion of the land at Hasler is perfectly sound given:

A. The very high risks from existing groundwater and surface water flooding which would have been increased by any further building on this area.

B. The significant problems associated with any increase in vehicle numbers onto the A259 as a result of building on the land at Hasler.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.9**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Para 2.9

Reference No. 15

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

'This local plan must guide development to the most appropriate locations'. It is obvious to anyone that New Monks Farm (NMF) is part of the same flood plain as Hasler (Old Monks Farm land) so why don't the same arguments against building apply to both? They are BOTH equally 'inappropriate locations'.

---



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The National Planning Policy Framework states that “The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development” (paragraph 6) and that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental (paragraph 7). The Framework explains that ‘These roles should not be taken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent.....Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously” (paragraph 8). This makes it clear that any activity that results in detriment to one or more of these “roles” is not sustainable development.

In fact, the Framework indicates that merely not causing harm to economic, social or environmental interests is not sufficient: “Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life” (paragraph 9).

At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a “presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking”. For plan-making, the Framework states that “Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change,... unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted” (Paragraph 14). Also “all plans should be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development” (paragraph 15).

In order to “objectively assess” housing needs, the Framework requires local planning authorities to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment” (SHMA) (paragraph 159). This of course is purely an assessment of need. When it comes to seeking to meet those needs through allocations of land for housing in a Local Plan, account has to be taken of environmental, infrastructure and other constraints. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the Framework, quoted above, where meeting these needs in full would lead to adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or where specific policies indicate development should be restricted, it is appropriate for the local planning authority not to seek these needs in full.

Adur’s housing needs have been objectively assessed through two particular studies: the Sussex Coast SHMA and Adur’s own Locally Generated Housing Needs Study. Paragraph 1.28 of the Plan explains that the main finding of the Sussex Coast SHMA is that “it was highly unlikely that the level of objectively assessed housing need required in these local authority areas can be achieved in the sub-region in the light of environmental, landscape and infrastructure constraints” (e.g. the National Park designation, river and coastal flood risk and biodiversity sites). Adur’s own Locally Generated Housing Needs Study (LGHNS) identified an even higher need than the Sussex Coast SHMA.

For Adur District, the Plan explains it will not be able to meet its full housing requirement due to, inter alia, significant flood risk issues and landscape constraints (paragraph 2.2) and that meeting the high level of demand in the LGHNS “would mean an extremely high level of development with a severe impact on green gaps, the landscape quality of Adur, biodiversity and on areas at risk of flooding” (paragraph 2.22).

The District Council therefore concludes, rightly and justifiably in the opinion of CPRE Sussex, that it should not seek to meet its own objectively assessed needs in full. The question, therefore, is to what extent it can meet its own objectively-assessed needs without damaging its character and environment (paragraph 2.2) ? Objective 1 of the Revised Draft Plan is to deliver between 2,797 – 2,947 dwellings up to 2031 to “contribute” to meeting objectively-assessed needs. However, the delivery of this range of dwellings depends on the development of two “sustainable greenfield urban extensions” (paragraph 2.10) at New Monks Farm and West Sompting.

CPRE Sussex has specific objections to the allocation of these two sites and does not consider them to be sustainable (see comments on Revised Draft Policies 5 and 6). The Trust therefore objects to the identification of these two greenfield sites in Revised Draft Policy 2.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 916

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Hargreaves Management Limited

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Representations from Hargreaves Management Limited

As significant landowners within the Adur area and particularly, Shoreham, Hargreaves have considered the revised draft Local Plan and have the following comments / observations.

2.

It is essential that a pipeline of employment land is provided throughout the plan period.

Considerable residential development is proposed within the Borough and employment land needs to be provided to accommodate this growth in the population as well as the continued expansion of existing Companies, both in relation to increasing their workforce due to the economic up-turn and such Companies,

currently located within the Borough being able to expand. There also needs to be provision for Companies who are currently not within the Borough but wish to locate within the Borough.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

## CONCLUSION

### 6.01

The District Council has consistently blocked consideration of the Steyning Road site for development uses based primarily on landscape concerns, which are unfounded and unsupported by the independent studies commissioned by the Local Authority to date. Noise impact and flood risk have also been exaggerated by the Local Authority even though technical solutions are available for their mitigation.

Whilst the Local Authority remains short of available sites, due to the immovable constraints of the sea to the south and the South Downs National Park to the north, it is inconceivable that they would be either instrumental or simply happy to allow the blighting of a readily developable site by the TWS within the existing urban fringe, which would be inconsistent with the NPPF requirement, paragraph 155, to take account of longer term requirements.

### 6.02

The NPPF requires Local Authorities to take decisions in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development and look for solutions rather than problems, paragraphs 186. It also requires Local Authorities to work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, paragraphs 187.

The NPPF requires Local Authorities to engage meaningfully with local organizations and businesses, paragraph 155, but we have been left to seek meetings and submit our own appraisals, which because they were not included in the first DLP have not benefitted from this earlier consultation. (See Appendix J – Meeting Minutes 2013, Appendix K – Email From LA & Appendix L – Meeting Minutes 2011)

### 6.03

Since the UFS 2006, the Steyning Road site has been removed from the AONB and falls outside the new South Downs National Park. There is a long established history of infill between the urban fringe and the A27 and between the urban fringe and the river, which the Revised DLP intends to exploit further. The Steyning Road site is low lying and screened by a mature natural hedgerow on the old railway embankment when viewed from the west, by the elevated flyover when viewed from the north and by existing buildings when viewed from the south and east. Any development of the site would be offset against a backdrop of the existing rising townscape to the south and east, and the elevated flyover to the north. Views from the adjacent A283 are either of the site or the sky, because they are so close, and any views from the elevated east or north over the site into the gap beyond the river would be retained. Therefore, the site could be developed without significant impact on the surrounding public or private visual, landscape amenity.

### 6.04

The Steyning Road site is demonstrably less constrained in comparison to other sites in the district across the full range of criteria set by the District Council. However, the Revised Draft Local plan accepts that issues of flood risk, highways access and impact, ecology, landscape impact, etc., can be solved with design and technical solutions to be brought forward by all the more constrained sites, which have been included in its strategic land allocation. Therefore, there is no reason why the Steyning Road site should not also be supported and encouraged by the Local Authority to bring forward similar solutions to the same range of slightly less significant concerns.

### 6.05

The Steyning Road site is available, accessible, deliverable and less constrained by the same measures of assessment applied to any comparable site that the Local Authority has put forward for strategic allocation. (See Appendix B – Sites Comparison Table) Therefore, the Steyning Road site:

1. should be included within the strategic land allocation for housing and employment uses within any adopted Local Plan;
2. should be removed from the Lancing local green gap;
3. and the Local Authority should be required to enter into revised consultation over the Tidal Wall Scheme to safeguard a longer term supply of

potential developable land within the District.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy Reference No. 19

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to these policies. The number of houses proposed in policy 3 is still far too high, and the requirement for up to 600 at New Monks Farm and 480 at West Sompting is completely unacceptable, both because of the strategic gaps and the flood risk. Also it is quite impossible to accommodate the extra traffic required, whatever measures are taken. As Adur has so few suitable sites (while there are many more in the less crowded north of England), I suggest that representations are made to the Government about the targets. If, as I suspect, the majority of people who respond to this consultation are against this level and setting of housing provision, even if the Plan is passed it should have a codicil that the respondents did not agree with these policies.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy Reference No. 758

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The two major traffic routes (A27 and A259) all already overburdened with both local and through traffic.

I object to any future development before a FULL bypass is built and in use.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

4.01

Spatial Strategy and the Local Green Gaps (Revised Draft Policies 2)

The Lancing Green Gap/BUAB should be redefined to release small quantities of land around its periphery and the remaining gap strengthened to secure its future long term.

To secure its future the new boundary should be redefined using the strongest existing physical features in the landscape, consistent with the NPPF (Chapter 9, paragraph 85) 'when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should: define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent'. These are:-

- The A27 Trunk Road to the North
- The River Adur to the East
- The Mainline Railway to the South
- The consistent and well defined built up urban edge of Lancing to the West.

All further proposed development within the redefined gap should be resisted and the open space retained as a functional flood plain.

Strategic Site Allocation (Revised Draft Policy 2, 4, 5)

The Strategic Land Allocation within the Revised DLP should be amended, as follows:-

The Shoreham Airport site should be removed from the strategic land allocation for employment or significantly reduced and re-orientated so that it is on the south side of the airfield, amongst the existing light industrial buildings and screened by the railway embankment to the south.

The New Monks Farm site should be restricted to development east of Marsh Barn Lane only. The L&ES states that 'The fields between the edge of the built-up area of Lancing and Marsh Barn Lane contribute little to the landscape setting of Lancing or the integrity of landscapes within the Strategic Gap' but the study goes on to describe Marsh Barn Lane as a 'natural landscape edge' and that the fields to the east of this lane form part of the central landscape of the Gap and make an important contribution to its sense of openness and 'greenness'.

The Steyning Road site should be included within the strategic land allocation for housing and employment use as it is already less constrained and more readily developable than other sites already included in the Revised DLP.

The Revised DLP should be amended to include a policy requiring the District to safeguard all potential available sites for future development use, given the constraints identified by the sea and the National Park on the District as a whole.

A general emphasis should be placed within the Revised DLP on using more infill or back garden sites and on redeveloping existing sites with either greater density or taller buildings for housing and employment, which is the only long term sustainable solution given the constraints of the District.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 743

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Chris Foss Designs

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

FLOODING: Recent press reports indicate 20,000 houses are at risk of flooding, yet more homes are proposed within the flood plain.

TRAFFIC: The existing road system is totally inadequate for even the current levels of traffic, with the A259 and A27 gridlocked at peak times. There are no new road networks proposed, whilst the unnecessarily complex roundabout proposed for the A27 will only add to the current traffic chaos. No further development should even be considered until an A27 Lancing/Worthing bypass is built.

AIRPORT: Proposed development seriously compromises the precious 'strategic gap', which has been so carefully protected for many years. Also, the housing proposed west of the airport could compromise safety by reducing the available space used for helicopter training, so noise could be an issue.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 722

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I fail to see why the Built Up Area Boundary near Steyning Close can be justified for change. This is an area which backs onto cemetery land, so I feel I should not be claimed for development. Once again contributing to more congestion in the area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The Ricardo site, existing developed land on airport and the 15000m2 allocation on airport should be in BUAB

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 720

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am objecting to the proposed building to the north of me at Steyning Close. I understand this to be open land and to be an extension of the cemetery as and when needed. The limited access will cause problems with so much extra traffic. Also, the building is very close, if not encroaching, on the covenant protecting Lancing Ring. This had been given to council in 1948 to the people of Lancing and Sompting.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 931

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Persimmon Homes South Coast

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Turley Associates

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

#### Fifth Paragraph

In accordance with the NPPF, every effort must be made by the Council to meet its objectively assessed housing needs within the district. Only once this has been robustly proven can a Council call upon adjoining authorities for assistance through the duty to co-operate. To achieve this, the Council must thoroughly test long standing policy designations to ensure they remain fit for purpose in the context of the social and economic needs facing the plan period. The Council have rightly in our view sought to review the former strategic gaps to release land that would not significantly compromise the gaps function. Given the Council are unable to meet objectively assessed housing needs even with such lands, the Council must adopt a much stronger stance to making effective use of these sites. The wording as currently drafted does little to emphasise just how important a contribution these sites make to the districts housing land supply, to meeting local needs for housing and for sustaining and growing the economy. The use of the words 'as long as this does not significantly compromise the Local Green Gaps' significantly dilutes the case the Council have made to release these sites for development. This creates uncertainty in our view and potentially inconsistency with the site specific policies proposed in the plan for these sites. The proposed allocation of these sites was arrived at on the basis of evidence that concluded they would not 'significantly compromise the Local Green Gaps'.

Suggest therefore the quoted section above be replaced with the following, 'which subject to the provisions of Draft Policy 5 and 6, would not significantly compromise the Local Green Gaps'.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 941

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Landstone Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation ECE Planning

Overall it is considered that the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 fails to reflect or comply with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. The failure of the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework stems primarily from the Council not positively or proactively planning to meet the locally identified housing need as indicated in the Locally Generated Housing Needs Survey (LGHNS).

The failure of the Local Plan to meet the identified housing need has been further compounded by the Councils unjustified decision not to allocate the land at Hasler for residential development despite, the significant flood alleviation works to be undertaken as part of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Scheme or, the requirement within the NPPF for Local Planning Authorities to plan for development in areas which can be developed through use of suitable adaptation measures.

Our client is keen to proactively and positively explore the residential development of the land at Hasler and discuss solution to overcome the remaining physical constraints.

We therefore hope that Adur District Council will reconsider their housing needs position and decision not to allocate the land at Hasler for residential development and engage proactively and positively in bringing the site forward to meet the locally identified housing need arising in the District.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 941

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Landstone Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation ECE Planning

Draft Policy 2 should be amended to increase the delivery of dwellings per year (closer to the identified need of 3540/245Dpa) following comprehensive analysis of cross boundary housing land supply and review of the Flood Zone 3a sites and development boundaries to enable further Greenfield land to be released in sustainable locations adjacent to existing settlements.

The Draft Local Plan must plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the District and the housing figures presented within Draft Policy 2 and highly constraining nature of Draft Policy 1 with regard to the release of sites such as Hasler.

The Council are considered to be failing to deliver sustainable development in the District and the wider area contrary to the findings of their evidence base. Therefore, for the aforementioned reasons the Draft Local Plan cannot be found legally compliant or sound and should be reviewed fundamentally to enable the delivery of significantly more housing to meet the clearly defined need.

Such revisions would enable an amended Draft Local Plan to be legally compliant and sound.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 941

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Landstone Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation ECE Planning

On this basis the Adur Local Plan must plan positively to meet the identified need within the District that, has been established by the Locally Generated Housing Needs Survey (LGHNS) as 4,590 dwellings (including 1,050 at Shoreham Harbour) between 2011 and 2028 (270/annum). Discounting those 1,050 dwellings that are to be provided within the Shoreham Harbour re-development, it is considered that Adur Local Plan must plan for 4,160 to be delivered within the District (2011-2013) at 208 dwellings per annum.

Contrary to the locally identified housing need of 208 dwellings per annum, the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 identifies two housing target options that are significantly lower than this identified need. The Preferred Option identified by the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan is for just 1747-1897 dwellings (excluding Shoreham Harbour) or 94 dwellings per annum over the plan period. It is clear that the Preferred Approach is significantly below the housing need identified within the LGHNS, even if the existing affordable housing deficit of 564 is not considered.

It is our considered view that the justification provided by Adur District Council to support the substantial departure from the identified housing need cannot be supported. We strongly contend that, in line with the objectives of National Planning Policy Framework and, recent decision of the Inspector with regards to the Waverley Borough Core Strategy, Adur District Council must adopt a proactive and positive approach in overcoming physical constraints on the delivery of residential development to meet identified need. "When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure." (Paragraph 99, NPPF).

On this basis it is considered that the Council proposal to not designate the land at Hasler for residential development cannot be justified as this site has the potential to yield a significant portion of housing numbers to meet the explicitly identified need within the District.

As is acknowledged within paragraph 2.5 of the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013, the implementation of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Scheme 'would result in the site no longer acting as 'functional floodplain'.' It is therefore our considered view that the land at Hasler harbours the potential to deliver residential development and, therefore our client hopes to engage in proactive discussions with Adur District Council, appointed flood experts and other relevant parties regarding the alleviation of the remaining flood risk and physical constraints on-site.

It is considered that physical site works and flood resilient design strategies can enable the site to come forward to deliver housing on this site, within the plan period, post implementation of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Scheme.

It is anticipated that these remaining constraints do not restrict the future residential development of the site and, through proactive discussions with Adur District Council and other relevant parties, the land at Hasler can yield residential development that contributes to meeting the defined locally generated housing need.

Overall, the proposed Draft Local Plan is considered to fail in respect of its legality and soundness for the aforementioned reasons.

Particular attention has been paid in these representations to housing land supply and delivery within Adur District and the surrounding area. The Council have failed to consider fully the ramifications of such an under supply in housing in the long term and therefore fail categorically to meet the objectives of the NPPF in providing sustainable development 'ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations'.

The significant deficit in market and affordable housing provision in the District will have a profound and harmful impact on the lives of future generations and the Council have not been creative in 'finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which we live our lives'.

The Council need to act positively to increase their housing supply to aid to meet the clearly defined need (245 Dpa annual need v 140/147 Dpa housing supply) including undertaking objective assessment of cross boundary need and specific requirements to address the current backlog of affordable housing provision.

The NPPF is clear at paragraph 7 that there are three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental. Unfortunately in resisting sustainable greenfield extensions to existing settlements (through arbitrary designation) the Council have considered housing supply in full with respect to only 1 dimension; Environmental protection.

The Council should therefore as part of their Draft Local Plan make strategic decisions to review their boundaries with regard to land within Flood Zone 3a.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 839

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Home Builders Federation Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 2 – Spatial Strategy

This question leads directly onto consideration of Revised Policy 2 and the justification for the spatial strategy that is being proposed.

All residential development is to be provided within the existing developed boundary (the Built Up Area Boundaries or BUAB). Some additional development may be provided outside of BUAB. The wording of the policy is extremely coy. The policy is cautious about the need to release sites in the Local Green Gaps despite the evidence of the scale of the unmet need. The policy merely states that two greenfield locations may be released at: (a) New Monks Farm, Lancing; and (or?) (b) West Sompting but only if this does not significantly compromise the Local Green Gaps.

We have a three concerns. Firstly, the local plan (Part 1) should be clear from the outset whether development at these two locations is going to be necessary in order to provide a bigger element of the unmet need. The Council needs to be more definitive. It needs to establish whether development at these two greenfield locations has a significantly adverse effect when judged against the policies of the NPPF, or whether the benefits of providing housing in these locations would outweigh any disadvantages. The Council needs to grasp this nettle now, not prevaricate through a vaguely worded policy. The plan provides the spatial strategy. It cannot leave the principle of development at these two locations in doubt.

Secondly, it is not at all apparent from the Sustainability Appraisal, or the report entitled Landscape and ecological surveys of key sites within the Adur District, November 2012, that development at the six locations would conflict to a significant and demonstrable degree with other policies in the NPPF. Specifically, how would development at the two locations referred to 'significantly compromise the Local Green Gaps'? Surely, the purpose of preparing a local plan is to establish whether the Gaps would be compromised by development. This prompts another question: would the benefits of development in these two locations in the Gaps outweigh the de-merits? Who is to be the judge? Is it a current minority of local residents immediately affected by the possible development of these locations, or should the Council attach much greater weight to the benefits that would accrue to larger numbers of future residents by building homes? This is the thrust of paragraph 7 of the NPPF which outlines the social purpose of planning: providing a supply of housing to meet the needs of present and future generations.

Thirdly, it is important to note that the Council has only carried out a tentative exploration of the alternative options available. It has only considered the six potential sites that are the subject of the study (this is clear from page 3 of the above report). It has not considered other locations within the Local Green Gaps. It is unclear how the Council decided that the six tested sites were the only suitable options.

The constraints: are these real or fictitious?

Paragraph 2.26 of the draft plan states that the SHMA Update 2012 identified significant constraints. These significant constraints, however, are not been established, only assumed. The report entitled Landscape and ecological surveys of key sites within the Adur District, November 2012, only assesses the effects of development of the six key sites that are considered as potential strategic allocations. It does not consider other development options.

It is also apparent from this study that the report authors have focused upon select elements of the NPPF to justify the local plan's restricted

approach to land supply. It has focused on the importance of protecting Green Infrastructure (pages 11 and 12). The weight the report authors accord to the protection of local Green Infrastructure (GI) is questionable and we do not consider it justified to the exclusion of the other objectives for the plan-led system articulated within the NPPF. It certainly would not amount to a 'significant and demonstrable' conflict with the NPPF.

The weight that is being attached to the maintenance of local GI becomes more dubious still when the damage that would be caused to local Green Infrastructure by the development at the six locations is not really explained or demonstrated. Furthermore, we see no reason why development at the six locations proposed would necessarily be to the detriment of local GI. New development can incorporate new GI or help to enhance existing GI.

In terms of landscape sensitivity, we note that the report on page 13 considers that none of the local landscape character areas were assessed as having high landscape character sensitivity. Some areas had relatively high landscape character sensitivity.

Two local landscape character areas were judged as having high visual sensitivity (page 17) mainly owing to views from recreational routes and areas 'often within the South Downs National Park'. Again, we would question the Council's priorities. The SDNP is a large area where house building of any significant scale will not be allowed to occur. Having retired this large tranche of land from development it is inevitable that people and new development activity will be directed to the areas outside of the park. This is what is occurring in Adur. Adur has a large unmet housing need. The SDNP is big and heavily protected. The Government has already attached significant weight to landscape and visual sensitivity of the area by virtue of its designation as a national park. The Council now needs to prioritise house building in those parts that fall without the park. Maintaining the gaps between the two settlements is probably a luxury that the Council can no longer afford.

Further, we would also question the assumption that development could not be sensitively executed to mitigate concerns about the potential visual disharmony that could be caused by new development.

In view of the disparity between the housing need and supply we consider the weight being attached to landscape and visual character is unwarranted.

It is also interesting that the authors cite the now defunct South East Plan (SEP) in defence of their methodological emphasis. The policies of the SEP that grew out of a consideration of regional objectives and constraints can no longer be assumed for the purposes of Adur's plan making. These were part of a carefully thought-out region-wide strategy that apportioned the overall development objectives of the region into those districts earmarked to become areas of growth and those districts where development would be more restrained. The strategy embodied by the SEP is now meaningless. It was rendered meaningless and ineffective as soon as those LPAs that were previously earmarked under the SEP to provide for higher levels of housing growth (the growth points) decided to abandon these plans when the Coalition Government's new planning regime was introduced. Examples are Milton Keynes/Central Bedfordshire, Ashford, Basingstoke, Reigate & Banstead, Mid Sussex. In other words, Adur can no longer draw upon the evidence and the strategy of the SEP in its defence. Nor can it assume that the former Growth Points will come to its rescue by accommodating Adur's unmet housing need. It must look to its own resources for a resolution to the problem of how to accommodate its objective housing needs. Under these new circumstances the weight given to the maintenance of GI, visual sensitivity etc and the emphasis in the SEP upon the need to manage urban-fringe sites, and protection accorded to the Strategic Gaps is unjustified.

The Strategic Gaps are referred to on page 12 of the report. It must be recognised that Strategic Gaps are local policy designations. They are not national designations like the Green Belt. Furthermore, it cannot be assumed that a local policy designation that was in the old plan is still relevant in today's context and for the purposes of future planning. The NPPF requires LPAs to distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national

and local designations so that protection is commensurate with the status of the designation (paragraph 113). In view of the degree of the unmet housing need we do not consider the weight accorded to the Strategic Gaps to be proportionate or appropriate.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 02: Spatial Strategy

Reference No. 955

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.5- it has been a good decision to exclude the Hasler/West Beach Estate due to our groundwater flooding, which have been exceptionally bad during the winter of 2012/13.

Building on this land will cause major flooding.

2.9- please note that NMF is on the same flood plain as Hasler which was Old Monks Farm!

---



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 786

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Housing Requirements - Policy Number 3 Objection.

I object on the grounds that: (1) there is no upper limit to the number of houses and (2) that the minimum number quoted is probably too high anyway.

I comment on the use of greenfield sites.

The assessment of the housing requirements appears to be based on the Locally Generate Housing Needs Study 2011 (LGHNS2011). I understand from comments made at a public meeting on 31 October 2013 that additional studies have been made but that they are not in the public domain. The figures for housing needs in The Plan do not match precisely any data provided in LGHNS2011. This document is still the only approved document against which The Plan may be validated.

The LGHNS2011 considers various theoretical options for housing growth and also considers practicalities of provision as foreseen at the time of the study. (I note that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is ongoing but we can only base our plans on evidence that is approved and is in the public realm).

The Council has selected a housing requirement on a mixture of natural population variation within Adur and net in-migration. I wish to challenge the technical bases upon which the housing need is assessed.

1. An Upper Limit to the Number of Houses to be Built Must be Set.

Policy Three allows for a minimum of 2797 dwellings. No maximum figure is given. The Council can build any number.

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) of the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013, published only in September 2013, states that there are an increasingly negative consequences for building more than 2635 (greater than Option 3). The 'positive' outcomes of building up to 4590 homes (Option 4) may each be questioned:

- The needs of all housing groups can be met (especially low cost and social housing) with a smaller number;
- Sustaining community life has more to do with social structure (outside government control) than housing;
- Improvement of services etc need not have anything to do with new housing;
- Improved energy etc can equally be applied to all Options.

In summary, building more than 2635 homes has rapidly increasing negative outcomes as the number is increased.

2. Reasons for Allowing a Modest Limit in New House Builds.

The SASEA2013 states that '...there is a scarcity of readily available land for new economic development'. And '...New business formation rates are relatively low...'. (Sections 3.7 and 3.8).

There is no particular reason for believing that expanding the population will result in increased business formation. Indeed, building houses may deprive local industry of the ability to expand in the first place.

Despite the perceived economic inadequacies of the District, the present employment profile is good. From the same report, 'As of 2012, 85.5% of the working age population in Adur were economically active which is higher than both the South East figure of 79.6% and the national figure of 76.9% (NOMIS)'. Section 3.12.

High levels of owner occupancy (Section 3.18), higher than national average levels of life expectancy (section 3.20), fairly good crime statistics (section 3.22) and good levels of education attainment compared to national averages paint a picture of Adur as not being a bad place to live.

Whilst the District has attracted low wage, low skill business, this type of economic activity is nonetheless important to the country as a whole. Although employment rates are good compared to the national average, there is always room for improvement.

A feature of the area is the very substantial number of working-age residents who commute out to neighbouring areas (nearly half). Around 5900 more people commute out of Adur each day than commute in (2001 figure). Further industrial and commercial development should focus on capturing the existing workforce. Even if those already living in Adur do not have relevant skills, it is always possible for appropriately skilled people to commute in. This is not the most desirable option since it adds to traffic congestion but it is still better than building more houses.

Finally, figure 3.8 of the LGHNS2011 shows that of the order of 2600 people per annum of working age migrate into Adur each year (average of 2004 to 2009). This probably equates to around 1000 houses changing hands each year (based on the quoted ration of 1 economically active person in an average household of 2.3). If high tech industry were to be attracted to the District - requiring a proportion of more skilled, more specialised personnel - these workers could be accommodated through the present levels of house sales and purchases.

The logical path to take is that of drawing on the pool of the workforce currently commuting out of the District (thereby easing some of the transport pressure in the process). Additionally, the talents of the currently unemployed should be utilised.

Given that the case for economic expansion is poor, and given that economic expansion could be accommodated using the existing workforce, the question remains, 'what would be a realistic target for housing based on practical questions of demand, supply, and desirable social outcomes?'

### 3. Housing Needs Assessment Based on Land Availability.

Policy 3 foresees a total of 1867 houses comprising 817 within Adur and 1050 at Shoreham Harbour. These figures assume the use of brownfield sites only.

From the LGHNS2011, a policy of Zero Net Migration (PROJ2 Figure D) would impose a housing requirement of only 1438 between 2011 and 2031. Assuming no net in-migration, there is room for the present social housing need to be met (1867 less 1438 = 429).

I note from a comment made at the Lancing meeting on 31 October 2013 that there is a requirement for low cost housing to attract the type of

workforce needed by local businesses.

The SASEA2013 states that Option 2 (1785 homes 2011-2028) '...would have no significant positive or negative impacts on the environment, social or economic objectives of the SA'. By extrapolation, the number of houses to 2031 would be 1983 units. This is only marginally greater than the figure projected for the brownfield site. Option 3 therefore is a valid option based on the evidence from Adur's own assessment.

From Section 2.2 of SASEA2013, I note that the Main Outcomes include:

'Protect and enhance green infrastructure, wildlife and habitats',

'Prioritise developments on brownfield sites',

'Protect and enhance the historic and natural environment'.

The proposed developments at Monks Farm and West Sompting do not comply with the above objectives.

The preferential use of brownfield sites should be included in the Plan. It is probable that if the above needs-analysis is adopted then there would be little need to develop our last remaining 'green fields'.

I am extremely concerned to note from both the Sompting and Lancing meetings that developers are lining up to develop our last green spaces. High property prices, cheap money, low cost labour from Eastern Europe and the high profit margins will all conspire to make the last of our greenery target for 'development'. Adur District Council will need to be very resolute to protect our last two remaining green spaces from early (and perhaps unnecessary) 'development'.

Infrastructure:

Nobody believes that the necessary changes to our crumbling and overworked infrastructure will be forthcoming in time to mitigate the impact of 'development'. Adur District Council's Position Statement B in its infrastructure Deliver Plan 2013 says as much.

BELOW ARE SOME SUGGESTED POLICY REVISIONS:

Revised Policy 3:

A maximum of 2000 houses shall be built on brownfield sites in Adur.

Houses shall be built according to the following priority:

- Social and low cost housing
- Housing to meet the needs of the ageing population
- Housing to meet the needs of the local industry as it develops.

The rate of delivery of houses shall be such as to meet demand and not exceed it

Greenfield sites shall only be considered after all brownfield sites have been exhausted.

Infrastructure shall be developed to match house-building such as to at least prevent worsening of present conditions.

A policy of no net in-migration shall be pursued.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 975

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation New Monks Farm Development Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Enplan UK Ltd

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS.

We consider that Adur District Council should make every effort to achieve the objectively assessed housing need of the District in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We do not consider there are landscape constraints to increasing the level of housing provision.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 841

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation NHS Property Sevices Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Page 29 sets out the proposed housing provision which, from a Healthcare perspective indicates that the suggested maximum of 2947 dwellings transcribes into a potential 6778 new residents/patients.

Historically, we are already struggling with some old and/or inadequate buildings for 21st Century health service delivery, in the Adur district, examples being Shoreham & Lancing Health Centres, Ball Tree & Kingfisher Surgeries.

Accordingly, replacement, refurbishment are key to being able to accept new patients from the planned developments and therefore capital improvements will require significant funding, which currently is limited, and therefore contributions from developers will be a pre-requisite. This either by existing Section 106 or the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

On a brighter note Northbourne Surgery in north Shoreham-by-Sea is scheduled to move into a bespoke, significantly refurbished Thakeham House, situated on the Southlands Hospital Site in the Spring of 2014. This will see Primary Care alongside Secondary Care and enable the surgery to widen its remit for the foreseeable future.

12th November 2013

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 894

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The policy makes no reference to demographics. The growth in housing requirements occurs as a result of the ageing population (ref demographic information published by West Sussex County Council). General housing particularly at the top end of the market will worsen the current overcrowding by encouraging people to move into the area while failing to meet the requirements of the existing ageing population and the associated carers required to care for them. This growth aspect has been completely ignored by the plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 974

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Brighton & Hove City Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Brighton & Hove City Council notes that Adur District Council is unable to provide for the full objectively assessed housing need in its area. This is a comparable situation to that facing Brighton & Hove and Adur is faced with similar environmental constraints. The City Council welcomes the attempts made by Adur to meet its housing requirement. In light of the significant shortfall in housing provision across the Coastal West Sussex housing market area, the District Council should assure itself that it has taken all possible steps to maximise its housing supply. The City Council looks forward to further cooperation with Adur and other authorities in the wider strategic housing market to establish a strategic approach to meeting objectively assessed housing need.

Furthermore, Brighton & Hove values the long-standing close partnership working with Adur with regard to the regeneration of Shoreham Harbour, and, more latterly, on the Greater Brighton City Deal.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 902

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I wish to object to the Revised Draft Policy 3: Housing Provision, as it relates to the building of 480 new homes at West Sompting, on the grounds that the introduction of such a large number of new households to the area will generate intolerably high volumes of additional traffic.

Since there are little or no facilities within the area for employment, secondary schooling, shopping and entertainment, most of the new residents (as with the existing) will need to travel in and out of the area on a daily basis. I expect that most of those journeys will take place by car.

Leaving aside the A27, West Sompting has only one road connecting it to the adjacent areas to the east and west: West Street. Consequently, the majority of all increased vehicle journeys are likely to occur along West Street.

Travelling east, West Street already has a very congested and potentially dangerous junction with Busticle Lane (particularly around school starting and finishing times) and, travelling west beyond Church Lane, it passes through the nightmare of parking/traffic calming measures of Sompting village. In the middle (at Dankton Lane) is a school crossing for pupils attending Sompting Middle school and overflow parking has started to occur around the junctions of Newmans Gardens, Street Barn and St Mary's Close.

The situation is already bad enough considering locally generated traffic in West Street, but it is made much worse by the westbound traffic trying to avoid hold-ups on the A27. The stretch of the A27 north of Sompting village is generally referred to as the Sompting Bypass but, in a complete reversal, West Street is now the de-facto relief road for the A27; a role for which it is entirely unsuited.

Therefore, I cannot support the proposed building of so many new homes in the catchment area of the existing roads.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

CPRE Sussex has specific objections to the allocation of the two greenfield sites at New Monks Farm and West Sompting and does not consider them to be sustainable (see comments on Revised Draft Policies 5 and 6). The Trust therefore objects to Revised Draft Policy 3 for its identification of these two sites for development. In addition, whilst CPRE Sussex has no objection per se to the proposed 2,797-2,947 dwellings over the life of the Plan, if this can only be achieved through green-field releases at New Monks Farm and Sompting then seeking to provide this level of housing development is unacceptable.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 881

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have read the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 and wish to make the following general comments: I am disappointed by the inadequacies of the plan insofar as flood control; housing on land vulnerable to possible flooding, especially with house insurance companies not being prepared to accept clients living in such areas; heights of new developments being more than four storeys high; traffic gridlock and consequent air pollution; insufficient NHS services, including medical, dental, care and mental health cover are concerned.

There must be many coastal towns in the country with very similar problems and it seems to me that Governments cannot expect the same rates of development as may be possible in inland towns. As expressed in the document, we are restricted by the South Downs, river and sea, as far as further development is concerned. Can coastal Local Councils nationwide not make a case to the Government, stating that it is not possible to provide the programme they insist on without destroying what we cherish in our towns and which make them pleasant and safe places in which to live?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 835

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Gladman Developments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Gladman welcomes the opportunity to submit comments regarding the consultation of the Draft Local Plan.

Gladman Developments specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. Gladman Developments has considerable experience in the development industry in a number of sectors including residential and employment land. From that experience, we understand the need for the planning system to provide local communities with the homes and jobs that they need to ensure that everyone has access to a decent home. Upon reviewing the Draft local plan and its supporting evidence base, Gladman are concerned regarding the ability of Adur Council, as well as the surrounding South-East region to deliver housing and also its ability to satisfy the Duty to Cooperate as stated in §178-180 of the NPPF. The SHMA and duty to cooperate studies by GL Hearn indicate a need of between 303 (5151 over the plan period) - 321 (5457 over the plan period) dwellings per annum in Adur and a need of between 63,400 - 69,900 over the sub-region. In deciding its target, Adur have adopted a growth scenario of 270 (4590 over plan period) dwellings per annum (Option A) which is approximately 1000 dwellings lower than the high growth scenario and 500 dwellings less than the lowest growth scenario which does not accord to Government's agenda of significantly boosting housing and economic growth. Although it is acknowledged that Adur experiences a number of constraints, such as the sea to the south and resultant flood risk and also the South Downs National Park to the North, Gladman questions whether enough has been done to satisfy the criteria of the NPPF. In the last Core Strategy draft, by giving Option B of 1000 more dwellings (even though this is short of the highest growth scenario) shows that additional growth is possible within the Council boundary, and as such we question whether the current position of choosing the lowest growth scenario is a decision which is more politically related than based on actual evidence of development potential. The Council are advised of the need to follow the advice set out in §159, 152, 14 & 47 of the NPPF for assessing their housing requirement. The process assesses the full, objectively assessed housing need before any consideration of the constraints that may act as a barrier to delivery. The GL Hearn duty to cooperate report of May 2013 supports the approach of the councils which make up the sub-region and states that given the predicament which the Councils in this SE sub-region find themselves in, that the methodology employed was based upon fulfilling the needs of the sub-region, rather than catering for in-migration from outside the sub-region. We question whether this approach is fully compliant with the Duty to Cooperate and is truly an "objectively based approach in identifying housing needs." Although the GL Hearn Report goes through the constraints such as the ability of the South Downs to deliver growth as a result of its National Park Designation, this does not itself stop appropriate sustainable development. Designations such as ANOB's or National Parks should be assessed through a detailed study to assess whether there are suitable sustainable sites that could be released to meet the need for housing without compromising the designation. This would lead to a boost in housing delivery, not just in Adur, but across the sub-region. We therefore question whether this assessment is a thorough assessment of all the options available.

As a result of the non-conformity across the sub-region there is an under-delivery of over 1000 dwellings in Adur, as well as a projected shortfall of 9900 dwellings across the sub-region which will also mean consequences for the delivery of affordable housing.

Taking the above into account, Gladman questions the soundness of Policy 3 – Housing Provision and whether there is a robust evidence base which supports the approach taken. We consider that the growth target is not a fully a objectively based approach for Adur which is repeated across the sub-region. We would hope that further work is carried out before the next stage of consultation before submission which exhausts all possibilities of housing delivery before the current approach is employed.

Gladman would wish to be listed on your database to be made aware of future planning Policy consultations.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 721

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation County Councillor for North Lancing and Sompti

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I submit for your consideration the following observations and comments appertaining to the Adur local plan.

As a lifelong Lancing resident, I have experienced many changes throughout the Adur District area and few have been to enhance the facilities for the local population. However, some of these changes have compromised the village characters of both Lancing and Sompting - this is compatible with current pressures from central government placed on local authorities.

Over recent years I have witnessed or been party to planning applications throughout the Adur District, in particular Lancing and Sompting. Whenever the planning committees have opted to object to plans to which the local community strongly object, a cloud of government bureaucracy overshadows the proceedings. Immediately, the decision for such planning applications is taken away from the elected local members and placed in the hands of a none elected external central government inspector.

The fear to the local government that in these cases have large legal costs incurred on the local authority is sufficient to allow all kinds of development through planning to the detriment of the area and the character of the villages.

All planning must take account of the following criteria: social, economic and environmental. Sadly, these three fundamental criteria have not always been met due to the reasons set out above.

Over the past 5-7 years, the following planning applications have, in my opinion, had to be accepted whether or not desirable for the village concerned or indeed in the local interest:

- The loss of the Willows nursery school in Irene Avenue, a central valuable school site that has now been replaced by residential housing.
- The West Lane youth centre and community hall that has been replaced with housing.
- The WRVS hall in North Lancing, now replaced with housing.
- The RNLI club in Tower Road Lancing, now replaced with flats.
- The badminton hall in Wembley Gardens, now replaced with flats.
- The Lancing Clinic in Irene Avenue, now replaced with housing.
- Cottages in West Lane, now replaced with high density housing.
- The Ball Tree public house in Bustical Lane Sompting, now replaced with houses.
- The construction of a vast football academy that has swallowed up acres of environmental wildlife habitat, with the inevitable displacement of underground and surface water.

All of the above have reduced the character of the village to a mere residential conurbation with little or nothing to enhance the local community. Now we find yet again the cloud of central government is to overshadow Lancing and Sompting with its demand for even more housing, and in areas designated as flood plain and wild life habitat.

The relentless pressure to accommodate the demand for housing in the South East by stealth is eroding the entire quality of life for the residents of the area.

The resultant infrastructure needed to support the proposed additional housing plan will not come to fruition in the foreseeable future and indeed may never materialise. The current road network has reached far beyond its capacity; the primary school numbers are at their maximum levels, the local hospital is under extreme pressure to carry out its obligations to the local community and most if not all doctors are working flat out to facilitate their patients already on their registers.

In essence, the 1800 premises which ADUR can accommodate with land of brown field sites which can be identified, must remain our housing target for the foreseeable future.

It is essential that long with any proposed housing development, social community facilities are provided for, along with serious consideration given, for the essential need of sustaining the irreplaceable wild life habitat to which is rapidly being eroded away at an alarming rate.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 1

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My concern with any of the options for additional housing is, will there be any further improvements in the infrastructure, ie: highways, to take in to account the extra traffic that will be generated, especially during the (mainly) morning peak period.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 839

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Home Builders Federation Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

### Revised Draft Policy 3 – Housing Provision

The housing requirement is capacity based. We are familiar with the reasons why the council considers that it is unable to meet its housing needs in full (e.g. paragraph 2.2) because of our recent involvement in the Brighton & Hove City Plan and its examination which shares the same SHMA and utilises similar arguments to justify the failure of the plan to meet its housing need. The Council maintains that it is unable to meet its full housing needs because of “a limited supply of brownfield and greenfield sites, significant flood risks issues, and landscape constraints.” We do not agree that this is a satisfactory response. We do not consider that the constraints cited are reasonable or that they do represent a significant obstacle to higher levels of development. The Council asserts that these are significant obstacles but only because it is looking for excuses not to meet it needs.

Paragraph 2.2 of the plan maintains that the objective need is between 215 and 245 dwellings per annum (dpa). Providing 245 dpa would require an overall target for 4,900 dwellings between 2011 -2031. Providing for 215 dpa would require an overall requirement for 4,300 homes to be provided between 2011-2031. Instead the planned level of provision is for either 2,947 dwellings, or 147 dpa or 2,797 dwellings, or 140 dpa as set out in the policy on page 29.

There is a gap in provision of between 1,950 dwellings when the upper level of need is measured against the upper level of planned provision, or 2,100 when measured against the lower level of planned provision. Figures are rounded.

When measured against the lower level of need compared to the upper level of supply then the gap is 1,350 dwellings. This increases to 1,500 dwellings if the lower level of need is compared to the lower level of supply. The box below summarises this.

Upper need 4,900	Upper supply 2,947	Gap 1,953
Upper need 4,900	Lower supply 2,797	Gap 2,103
Lower need 4,300	Upper supply 2,947	Gap 1,353
Lower need 4,300	Lower supply 2,797	Gap 1,503

At worst, there is a gap between need and supply of 2,100 dwellings. At best the gap shrinks to 1,300. Against either scenario this is a significant scale of undersupply that the local plan must have a strategy for dealing with.

Figure 1 on page 166 of the plan is misleading because it states that the gap between need and supply is only 300 over the twenty years of the plan. But this is only the case on the basis of Adur providing 200 dpa which is the maximum number of homes considered deliverable and comparing this to the lower level of need of 215dpa, not the higher of 245dpa. Page 2 of the Sequential and Exceptions Test for the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 puts the objective need at a figure at 4,600. This equates to 230 dpa which is the median figure that is referred to in paragraph 2.25 of the plan.

If the gap between need and proposed supply cannot be addressed within Adur's borders (although we would contend that more could be accommodated) then Adur must have a plan that will provide for these unmet needs elsewhere. Like the other authorities of the Sussex Coast, Adur cannot ignore its unmet needs. It cannot assume that its unmet needs will be accommodated by someone else unless it has brokered a deal with another authority to provide land for housing to allow this to take place. This would need to be demonstrated in Adur's local plan.

Adur has no such plan. Nor has Adur been able to demonstrate that there is spare capacity being provided elsewhere. None of the Sussex Coast are able to meet their own needs in full (illustrated in figure 1 on page 166), although none of these authorities have ventured to explore more radical planning options that would allow more homes to be provided. Furthermore, none of the authorities to the north are planning to provide for more than their own needs. This represents a collective failure to plan to address the development needs of the area. Adur cannot expect to sweep this problem under the carpet.

We note that Adur has lodged an objection to Mid Sussex's plan on the basis of the legal discharge of the duty to cooperate, though it did not challenge Mid Sussex's plan on the basis of its strategy or the housing numbers. Adur along with Brighton and Lewes councils made approaches to Mid Sussex to provide assistance in helping them to meet their own needs. At the Exploratory Meeting relating to Mid Sussex's submitted plan held on 16 September, Adur participated, but stated at the hearing that it raised no objection to the strategy or the level of the housing requirement proposed by Mid Sussex as such (see page 4 of the note of the Exploratory Meeting). We do not consider this to be a reasonable or logical position for Adur to hold in view of the disparity between need and supply. If Adur agrees that the partner authorities of the Sussex Coast area are unable to meet their needs in full, which one assumes it does because it is a signatory to the Coastal West Sussex Partnership collaborative work (including the joint SHMA), then it would be compelled to look towards the north to address its unmet needs. Inevitably, this would require undertaking joint-planning with the two authorities to the north - Horsham and Mid Sussex.

We note that overtures were made to Mid Sussex, but Mid Sussex declined to assist. Owing to this lack of success Adur Council is compelled to make an objection to Mid Sussex's plan on the basis that Mid Sussex's strategy and its housing provision was unsound because it refused to act constructively and come to the assistance of Adur and the other West Sussex Coast authorities. It is also illogical for Adur to object to Mid Sussex's plan without substantiating what it considers to be the shortcomings of Mid Sussex's plan. We note that in the joint statement that was submitted by Adur to Mid Sussex's local plan examination (a joint statement prepared with Brighton, Lewes and Worthing councils) that the Council states that it had made an overture to Mid Sussex to be involved in joint strategic planning owing to severe capacity constraints in the Adur as well as in the other West Sussex Coast authorities. Despite this approach, the statement goes on to note that no joint working with Adur and Worthing subsequently occurred (page 2) presumably because of intransigence on the part of Mid Sussex Council.

Of course there remains the possibility that the outcome of the Mid Sussex examination that is currently underway will result in Mid Sussex Council being encouraged to do more to assist its southern neighbours in order to have a sound plan. However, until Mid Sussex Council produces a new plan that actually provides some land to help accommodate an element of Adur's unmet needs, then Adur Council will have to consider an alternative way of delivering its housing needs. This would necessarily entail the Council revisiting some of its assumptions about the 'significant constraints' on land supply in the district.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 941

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Landstone Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation ECE Planning

On this basis the Adur Local Plan must plan positively to meet the identified need within the District that, has been established by the Locally Generated Housing Needs Survey (LGHNS) as 4,590 dwellings (including 1,050 at Shoreham Harbour) between 2011 and 2028 (270/annum). Discounting those 1,050 dwellings that are to be provided within the Shoreham Harbour re-development, it is considered that Adur Local Plan must plan for 4,160 to be delivered within the District (2011-2013) at 208 dwellings per annum.

Contrary to the locally identified housing need of 208 dwellings per annum, the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 identifies two housing target options that are significantly lower than this identified need. The Preferred Option identified by the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan is for just 1747-1897 dwellings (excluding Shoreham Harbour) or 94 dwellings per annum over the plan period. It is clear that the Preferred Approach is significantly below the housing need identified within the LGHNS, even if the existing affordable housing deficit of 564 is not considered.

It is our considered view that the justification provided by Adur District Council to support the substantial departure from the identified housing need cannot be supported. We strongly contend that, in line with the objectives of National Planning Policy Framework and, recent decision of the Inspector with regards to the Waverley Borough Core Strategy, Adur District Council must adopt a proactive and positive approach in overcoming physical constraints on the delivery of residential development to meet identified need. "When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure." (Paragraph 99, NPPF).

On this basis it is considered that the Council proposal to not designate the land at Hasler for residential development cannot be justified as this site has the potential to yield a significant portion of housing numbers to meet the explicitly identified need within the District.

As is acknowledged within paragraph 2.5 of the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013, the implementation of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Scheme 'would result in the site no longer acting as 'functional floodplain'.' It is therefore our considered view that the land at Hasler harbours the potential to deliver residential development and, therefore our client hopes to engage in proactive discussions with Adur District Council, appointed flood experts and other relevant parties regarding the alleviation of the remaining flood risk and physical constraints on-site.

It is considered that physical site works and flood resilient design strategies can enable the site to come forward to deliver housing on this site, within the plan period, post implementation of the Shoreham Tidal Walls Scheme.

It is anticipated that these remaining constraints do not restrict the future residential development of the site and, through proactive discussions with Adur District Council and other relevant parties, the land at Hasler can yield residential development that contributes to meeting the defined locally generated housing need.

Overall, the proposed Draft Local Plan is considered to fail in respect of its legality and soundness for the aforementioned reasons.

Particular attention has been paid in these representations to housing land supply and delivery within Adur District and the surrounding area. The Council have failed to consider fully the ramifications of such an under supply in housing in the long term and therefore fail categorically to meet the objectives of the NPPF in providing sustainable development 'ensuring that better lives for ourselves don't mean worse lives for future generations'.

The significant deficit in market and affordable housing provision in the District will have a profound and harmful impact on the lives of future generations and the Council have not been creative in 'finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which we live our lives'.

The Council need to act positively to increase their housing supply to aid to meet the clearly defined need (245) Dpa annual need v 140/147 Dpa housing supply) including undertaking objective assessment of cross boundary need and specific requirements to address the current backlog of affordable housing provision.

The NPPF is clear at paragraph 7 that there are three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental. Unfortunately in resisting sustainable greenfield extensions to existing settlements (through arbitrary designation) the Council have considered housing supply in full with respect to only 1 dimension; Environmental protection.

The Council should therefore as part of their Draft Local Plan make strategic decisions to review their boundaries with regard to land within Flood Zone 3a.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Alternative Wording for Policy 3.

Adur District Council will adopt a policy of zero net in-migration into Adur unless there is an expansion in the number of jobs available. Where there is an expansion in the requirement for labour, preference shall be given to utilising the skills of local unemployed persons or drawing on the pool of residents who currently commute out of the district for work.

Over the period 2011-2031 up to approximately 2,000 houses may be built on Brown field sites including approximately 1,000 as part of Shoreham Harbour development and 1,000 within the built up area of Adur. These houses will be built at such a rate as to make provision for natural expansion in the local population.

Green field sites will not be considered until all Brown field sites have been used.

Where Green field sites must be used, the total number of houses (adjacent to Sompting) shall not exceed [the figure given for the 2012 draft]. If an expansion in the Adur workforce cannot be met by using local residents then additional housing (including use of Green field sites) may be considered.

The consequences of any development must not lead to further deterioration in traffic, further pollution or aggravate any other existing issues.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 840

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Cemex UK Properties Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Deloitte Real Estate

Revised Draft Policy 3: Housing Provision, states that during the plan period (2011 – 2031) there will be 1050 houses delivered on brownfield sites in the Shoreham Harbour broad location and Revised Draft Policy 22: Density, states that new residential developments should achieve densities of a minimum of 35 dwellings per hectare, but development in the defined town/village centres and Shoreham Harbour will be expected to achieve higher densities. CEMEX broadly supports these policies, however the responsibility of ensuring that noise generated by local employment functions does not disturb new residents should fall with the developers. Development that prejudiced the continued use of the CEMEX site or resulted in operational restrictions being put in place would be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 21 bullet point 3 and Paragraph 143 bullet point 4.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 931

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Persimmon Homes South Coast

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Turley Associates

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

It is noted from the plans 'Background Evidence Document' (ADC, 2013) that further demographic and household projection updates are being undertaken to take account of the more recent 2011 census data.

We support the need to bring this evidence base up to date and to robustly test the revised outputs through an updated Sustainability Appraisal. The conclusions of this should then be consulted upon to justify the final housing requirement taken forward in the Submission Local Plan next year. We would suggest that in addition to the 2011 census data that an updated Experian employment growth forecast is factored in. In addition, assessments of unmet housing requirements from adjoining authorities should be updated and evidence tabled to show what contribution Adur District should be making towards meeting such needs. The housing growth scenarios arising from these updated assessments should be tested through an updated Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The Inspector examining the Local Plan should be provided with clear evidence that the objectively assessed housing requirements were positively prepared, then robustly tested through a robust SA to arrive at a justified housing requirement for the Local Plan. A strategy for addressing unmet needs through the Duty to Co-Operate must also be made clear in the Local Plan.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Objection 1: Total Number of Dwellings according to Sustainability Criteria.

'Over the period 2011-2031 a minimum of 2797-2947 dwellings will be developed in Adur, as follows:  
817 within the built up area of Adur, plus  
1050 as part of the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area Western Arm  
450-600 at New Monks Farm  
480 at West Sompting'.

From Revised Draft Policy 3: Housing Provision.

We challenge the housing requirement statement on a number of grounds.

We note from the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan (September 2013) that allowance is made for 2797-2947 dwellings. The sustainability criteria (and many other criteria) are based on these figures (Paragraph 7.1 point 1). Yet The Plan envisages a minimum allowance of these figures. Moreover, the 'Locally Generated Housing Needs Study Final Report May 2011', (LGHNS2011) considers up to 5,000 homes based on using land outside of the urban area (i.e. Green field).

#### TOTAL POTENTIAL LAND AVAILABLE.

7.21 If the potential of all of the sites identified is included, including those sites outside of the existing urban area, we estimate that between 4150-5000 homes could be delivered over the period from 2006 to 2031.

From LGHNS2011 Paragraph 7.21.

Sompting lies adjacent to one of the only two Green fields left under Adur District Council's control. This leads us to the conclusion that in the future there will be even more attempts to 'fill the gap' to the east of our village.

We therefore propose that the figure of 2947 dwellings should be considered an upper limit, not a minimum. However, there are other issues apart from 'sustainability' that may affect even this figure.

Objection 2: Total Number of Dwellings Based on Growth Projections.

The Locally Generated Housing Needs Study 2011 includes an assessment of future housing needs based on two growth projections. These are summarised in paragraph 9.6:

9.5: A realistic assessment of housing need/demand is for between 235-255 dwellings per annum over the period of 2011-28, or for between 270-320 households for the period 2011-31.

In both cases the higher end figure represents our assessment of housing need/demand based on past population and demographic trends (PROJ

1), whilst the lower figure adjusts this to take account of projected economic growth (PROJ 9).

This paragraph is critical to understanding Adur District Council's policy for housing provision and therefore the requirement to build on sites adjacent to Sompting. (This paragraph is also quoted in Background Evidence Document).

Projection 1 (PROJ 1) assumes that existing levels of in-migration (for work and retirement) are maintained. Whereas in the past land, jobs and houses were available for industrial expansion, this is no longer the case. We conclude that 'PROJ 1' (everything carries on as before) is not a viable scenario upon which to base housing needs.

Projection 9 (PROJ 9) is based on the assumption that economic growth within the area will drive a requirement for more workers, hence more houses. However there are two mitigating factors to take into consideration: Firstly, the report says that the economic model does not take account of government spending cuts. These are a consequence of the national debt (among other causes). Diminished government expenditure is likely to remain the norm for a long time.

The second is that the Sustainability Report paragraph 3.7 states that '...there is a scarcity of land available for economic development'. Therefore, assuming that national economic growth forecasts (and therefore additional housing requirements) can be applied to Adur is erroneous.

The housing demand for Adur is based on Projections 1 and 9. These projections seem unrealistic.

Alternative growth models should be considered.

### Objection 3 Based on Sustainable Communities.

1.41 The National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012 sets out national policy as a basis for plans such as this, and is a material consideration in determining planning applications. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is a fundamental principle of the NPPF26 which views the planning system as having three key roles:

- (...)
- a social role, supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities; and
- (...)

From Revised Draft Adur District Plan 2013 (RDALP2013) Paragraph 1.41

The village of Sompting has seen far greater 'development' in its time than any other area in Adur. The pace of development over the years has provided many challenges to Sompting Parish Council. In particular, the construction of large property developments (as distinct from incremental enlargement) has resulted in disjointed communities. These communities are distinguished by age group, family situation, income group and dwelling type.

Sompting Parish Council (SPC) has endeavoured to develop Sompting's community identity throughout its history. SPC has organised the annual Sompting Festival, encouraged various user groups to meet at the Harriet Johnson Centre, provided an annual carol service and liaised with

community groups such as the Lions, with a view to enhancing social cohesion. The creation of two new large housing estates would necessarily bring with it an influx of new people who are not socially connected to the village, and the work of building a sustainable community made even more challenging.

The diminution of the strategic gap between Sompting and Worthing would lead to the perception that Sompting is no more than a geographical zone within an urban sprawl. The coalescence of Lancing and Sompting villages has caused some loss of identity to both. However, we cannot turn the clock back. What we can do is to ensure that the Lancing and Sompting villages do not become part of a greater urban sprawl.

#### Objection 4 Based on Total Housing Requirement.

We note especially from the LGHNS2011 that:

'Net in-migration to Adur is a key driver of population growth as the death rate in the District is higher than the birth rate. With no net migration, the population would decline marginally over the next 20 years, by -1.8% between 2006-26 (PROJ 2\_). With no net in-migration the population structure would also age more rapidly. However even with no net in-migration there will still be a requirement for more homes, as a result of changes in the age structure and household sizes.

1,354 households would be required to 2026 (68 per annum).

From LGHNS2011 'Trend Based Projections, Executive Summary'

We would point out that population growth for Adur will have been taken from national statistics. These national figures will have been skewed by mass immigration in recent years. We are aware that national government is committed to addressing this issue. Therefore, even the above figure for housing requirements may be too large.

Also from the same study, under the 'Zero Net Migration Scenario (PROJ 2)' the housing need falls to 1,354 for the period 2006 to 2026. When figures are re-calculated for the period covered by The Plan (2011-2031) it is not likely that the total requirement will change.

The figure for zero population growth (PROJ8) is 1,802. Again, adjustments may be made to cover the period of The Plan. However, the point is that given the limitations in both job growth and available land for housing, the above two scenarios are realistic. The calculated demands for housing are both a lot less than those in the current Plan.

From the Background Evidence Document Table titled 'Indicative Housing Trajectory - Delivering 140 Dwellings Per Year', we note that net available new housing using Brown field sites only is 1962 units. (This is based on 2892 less 450 Monks Farm and 480 Sompting).

The Plan paragraph 2.31 suggests that 1,867 houses may be built on Brown field sites (based on SHLAA 2012).

We conclude that policies of zero population growth and/or zero net in-migration will result in future housing needs being met by use of existing

Brown field sites only. This is deemed to be a pragmatic approach based on what can be achieved with what we have. It is possible to avoid use of Green field sites with appropriate policies.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision Reference No. 4  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

I am one of the families that suffered (and I mean suffered) the consequences of last Christmas flooding. I don't know, but I am assuming that the council representatives proposing this insane idea, do not live in the area in question? The idea of building on a flood plain is as stupid as a chocolate teapot.

Apart from the building issue, what about the traffic increase that will follow? Anyone who uses the A27 will know that it is running (no pun intended) under pressure at peak times now. To increase the traffic on it is an accident waiting to happen. I understand that new houses must be built in the country, but "ON A FLOOD PLAIN"? Come on!!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 03: Housing Provision Reference No. 19  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

I object to these policies. The number of houses proposed in policy 3 is still far too high, and the requirement for up to 600 at New Monks Farm and 480 at West Sompting is completely unacceptable, both because of the strategic gaps and the flood risk. Also it is quite impossible to accommodate the extra traffic required, whatever measures are taken. As Adur has so few suitable sites (while there are many more in the less crowded north of England), I suggest that representations are made to the Government about the targets. If, as I suspect, the majority of people who respond to this consultation are against this level and setting of housing provision, even if the Plan is passed it should have a codicil that the respondents did not agree with these policies.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Para 2.36**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Para 2.36

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Employment and Economy

2.36: In the second sentence, should this refer to the 2011 Census?

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Strategic Site Allocation (Revised Draft Policy 2, 4, 5)

The Strategic Land Allocation within the Revised DLP should be amended, as follows:-

The Shoreham Airport site should be removed from the strategic land allocation for employment or significantly reduced and re-orientated so that it is on the south side of the airfield, amongst the existing light industrial buildings and screened by the railway embankment to the south.

The New Monks Farm site should be restricted to development east of Marsh Barn Lane only. The L&ES states that 'The fields between the edge of the built-up area of Lancing and Marsh Barn Lane contribute little to the landscape setting of Lancing or the integrity of landscapes within the Strategic Gap' but the study goes on to describe Marsh Barn Lane as a 'natural landscape edge' and that the fields to the east of this lane form part of the central landscape of the Gap and make an important contribution to its sense of openness and 'greenness'.

The Steyning Road site should be included within the strategic land allocation for housing and employment use as it is already less constrained and more readily developable than other sites already included in the Revised DLP.

The Revised DLP should be amended to include a policy requiring the District to safeguard all potential available sites for future development use, given the constraints identified by the sea and the National Park on the District as a whole.

A general emphasis should be placed within the Revised DLP on using more infill or back garden sites and on redeveloping existing sites with either greater density or taller buildings for housing and employment, which is the only long term sustainable solution given the constraints of the District.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We believe this allocation is too small

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

CPRE Sussex has specific objections to significant development at Shoreham Airport (see comments on Revised Draft Policy 7) and New Monks Farm (see comments on Revised Draft Policy 5). CPRE Sussex therefore objects to Revised Draft Policy 4 for its allocation of these two sites for significant employment development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 895

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Redfly Aviation Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I would suggest that the choice of roundabout location on the A27 should be at New Monks Farm. Housing development is far more likely to happen than smaller scale development within Shoreham Airport, and so it would make sense to serve the needs of housing as priority. I would assume that the traffic lights would remain as they are at the Sussex Pad junction. More importantly, if a roundabout were to be installed at the Sussex Pad, the enhanced access to the A27 from the airport perimeter road, Cecil Pashley Way, would encourage the greater use of this as a "rat run" from Shoreham Beach to the A27. Cecil Pashley Way is not designed to be a through route and there is already congestion at times within the airport due to lorries unloading. A roundabout to the West would be the only logical solution, whilst maintaining the existing junction at the Sussex Pad unchanged. This would also maintain proper access to and from Lancing College.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 1169

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Adur & Worthing Business Partnership

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The AWBP is concerned at the reduction of land allocated for employment use. It is considered that this puts economic growth at risk. The AWBP would seek a sensible increase in the land allocated for employment to allow for sustainable economic growth.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 985

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Apollo Aviation Advisory Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing both as a resident of North Lancing and as an existing business based at Shoreham Airport.

Objections to the draft local plan on grounds which apply equally to Draft Policy 4, 5 and 7 are:

a) The Adur District is constrained physically by the South Downs National Park to the North and the Sea to the South. The A27 and the A259 are already heavily congested at certain times. The congestion on the A27 west bound starts at the North Lancing Roundabout but the root of the cause is further West as traffic has to negotiate the Hill Barn cross roads, Lyons Farm traffic lights, the A27 capacity halving to a single carriageway (in effect until west of Worthing) and the Grove Lodge roundabout. The reverse applies eastbound. It is hard to see how this situation can be changed without building a by-pass in the National Park, an obviously remote outcome. Unless land is reclaimed from the sea, an even more unlikely prospect, there appears to be little possibility of significantly improving the A259. The proposed new roundabout, wherever situated, may provide better and safer access to the proposed developments, but will only add to the traffic on the A27 and potentially slow down the flow of cross traffic. Therefore:

- i) The proposed developments will lead to totally unacceptable levels of traffic on the A27 making the area less attractive to both residents and businesses;
- ii) The proposed developments would lead to increased pollution and damage to the environment caused by the exhausts of queuing traffic.

B) Both developments lead to an erosion of the Green Gap between Shoreham and Lancing leading to a further loss of the attractiveness of Adur to existing and potential residents.

C) Both proposed developments are in flood zones, not all tidal, which unless carefully managed will cause flooding to existing properties. As has already been demonstrated on a number of occasions recently to the discomfort of residents.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 786

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PROPOSED REVISED POLICY 4.

Permitted developments shall be targeted to utilise the workforce who currently travel out of Adur each day for work.

Infrastructure shall be developed to match industrial growth such as to prevent worsening of present conditions.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 916

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Hargreaves Management Limited

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Representations from Hargreaves Management Limited

As significant landowners within the Adur area and particularly, Shoreham, Hargreaves have considered the revised draft Local Plan and have the following comments / observations.

4.

It is essential that a pipeline of employment land is provided throughout the plan period. Considerable residential development is proposed within the Borough and employment land needs to be provided to accommodate this growth in the population as well as the continued expansion of existing Companies, both in relation to increasing their workforce due to the economic up-turn and such Companies, currently located within the Borough being able to expand. There also needs to be provision for Companies who are currently not within the Borough but wish to locate within the Borough.

Revised Draft Policy 4

Having regard to the considerable amount of space proposed in one location; Shoreham Airport / New Monks Farm, consideration must be given as to the constraints imposed on these sites including flooding, the necessary transport and infrastructure requirements including a new junction on the A27. As a result of this, consideration should be given to other sites where, in the absence of the proposed development at Shoreham Airport / New Monks Farm and to an extent the Shoreham Harbour area not coming forward, other sites can be provided. This is particularly the case, having regard to only one access being available onto the A27 as specified at Clause 2.5.7; this potentially means that one of the proposed employment sites may not be forthcoming, unless agreement can be reached over access.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 04: Planning for Economic Growth

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Many of the housing and infrastructure development proposals arise from a vision for economic improvement. We note from paragraph 2.39 of The Plan:

2.39 The recent economic downturn has not had a significant impact on Adur's economy, and although economic activity rates fell from 85% to 80% immediately after the downturn, they are now back to 85%.

And from the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental; Assessment 2013:

3.12 As of 2012, 85.5% of the working age population in Adur were economically active which is higher than both the South East figure of 79.6% and the national figure of 76.9% (NOMIS).

Employment prospects are better than average and local employment seems to be resilient in the face of economic downturns.

In respect of delivering a flexible economy, we note that:

3.15 A significant amount of people that live in Adur commute to work outside of the district. Although there are no up-to-date figures regarding out-commuting, at the time of the 2001 Census only 43.7% of those living in the Adur district who are economically active actually worked in the district. The majority of those commuting out of the district were mainly travelling to Brighton & Hove and Worthing.

Employment growth in Adur should be accommodated through the provision of local labour rather than importing new labour with consequent housing and infrastructure issues. The use of existing labour would also reduce the burden of commuting.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 713

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We cannot cope on the A27 with the volume of traffic already, especially at peak times in the summer when it can be gridlocked. These plans would only mean more traffic on the roads.

This is a flood land. I personally have seen this land badly flooded at least a few times over the years.

We don't need anymore 'affordable homes'. We have very good bungalows and semi's, and as people die off (we have a lot of elderly people), young people can buy them at a premium and rennovate.

We need to invest and support businesses which are struggling in Lancing, along with the Churchill Estate - not create other businesses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 719

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PARA 2.61 FLOOD PLAIN RISK.

Even higher than shown, due to rising sea levels and poor maintenance of sluice gates.

IS SEA LEVEL RISING?

If so, then the drainage options via the sluice gate are going to be even more restricted, i.e. the higher the sea level, the less time each day there will be for drainage to happen. It sounds as if the gates are higher to accommodate the Voles anyway, which only exacerbates the situation!

MAINTENANCE OF SLUICE GATES.

Are the sluice gates raised automatically? With the poor maintenance being observed everywhere, is a failure here likely? How does anyone check they are open or shut?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 714

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am concerned that any future development in the West Beach area will only make the flooding worse.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 738

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Any building on the flood plain will affect the West Beach Estate. The Estate roads already flood by high tide.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 711

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Building on our wetland will only make flooding worse for our properties,

So, NO to any buildings!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 136

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to you, because I feel if anymore homes are built on NMF flood plain, our homes on West Beach (formally the Hasler Estate) will flood. The water is at its worst at the moment, so imagine more properties I feel will make matters much worse. It is also becoming difficult getting onto the Brighton Road, so if more homes are built with on average 2 cars per home, can you imagine the chaos this will cause. At the moment you cannot walk out of the door, you need a boat. Will the Council take over the roads and pavements? We pay the same Council Tax, but in my opinion don't get the same services.

I would also bring to your attention, facilities for the extra people who will live in these properties; schools, doctors, hospitals. I have recently had my hospital appointment cancelled 5 times. I hope these points will be taken into consideration when you reach your decision.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 732

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Opposed to building on Monks Farm as it is a flood plain and could affect our Estate.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 692

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have not lived here long, but I have already seen bad flooding in West Way and this can only get worse if the building of 600 homes goes ahead. Furthermore, the traffic is terrible (I should know, I lived in Croydon!) Another 200+ around would be impossible and frightful to contemplate, let alone contend with everyday. This is without the destruction of a beautiful wildlife habitat.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 509

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Plans to build up to 600 houses on the New Monks Farm site are ludicrous, not only in intent, but also in delivery.

The proposed site is exceptionally fragile as a flood plain – not for river flooding, but simply as an area that works to shift excess ground water from the Downs to the sea. The water table is so high there that no mitigation could possibly be effective, as even tanks would be filled by the naturally high water levels.

The area has flooded naturally for centuries and it is only since building around the edges that problems have arisen around Monks Farm estate and the West Beach estate on the eastern and southern edges respectively. Following the past couple of years of wet weather, which arguably is set to continue, drainage has been shown to be insufficient and the current inhabitants have suffered greatly due to flooding. To propose up to 600 extra homes, along with a school and associated infrastructure, knowing that they too will be have a high risk of flooding is reckless. It's about time we draw a line against carving up, channelling and messing about with how our environment functions and look for other solutions.

I also feel that not enough has been done with regards to the neighbouring Council's duty to cooperate. There are prime sites on the outskirts of current development in Lancing and Sompting, north of the A27 that could be used without any detriment to the new National Park. I feel that the housing quota, if we have to have that many houses (which is debatable without the necessary, but sensible, upgrades to infrastructure) could be spread more evenly over areas with less environmental impact.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 92

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Traffic congestion.

Poor transport facilities.

Danger due to narrowness of road and lack of pavements through the village.

Hundreds of extra houses would adversely affect the village.

Lack of schools, shops and central amenities conducive to a large project. The facilities need to be improved before extra housing is considered, current doctors practice (Balltree) is poorly managed. And unable to cope or give a good cover to current patient, any more on their books would be a disaster!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 93

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly oppose any building on Monks Farm as it is on our flood plain and I do not wish any more water in my garden as I get quite a lot in the winter.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 94

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As a resident of West Beach estate for over 14 years it is obvious that any new development on this flood plain would only raise the water table even higher. As the drainage system can't cope with the present volume of water I can't see that any new development would do anything but increase the flooding problems.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 508

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am one of the people that suffered with flooding last Christmas also many times in the past, also having sewer problems. The extra volume of traffic is a cause for concern.

Manor Close is quite narrow so if used for future through traffic it would be a great problem as some houses do not have any garages or driveways. The protection of local wildlife is very important, we have badgers, deer, foxes wood peckers and all other forms of creature in the area. Please listen to the environmental inspector.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 96

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to this policy on three counts.

1. This area is marshland, entirely unsuitable for this amount of building. Drainage is very poor, the A27 has often been flooded also local houses haven't been able to use their toilets.
  2. The East / West route is already impossible especially in the summer. To add to this problem with an access roundabout at Monks farm is madness. We regularly sit in grid locked traffic, often for 40 minutes at a time, causing cheating and road rage. The suggestion that public transport might ease the problem will never happen. It's far too expensive and infrequent. Our buses from worthing in the evenings have been cut out , forcing us to use our cars.
  3. We are a water shortage area, often on hosepipe bans, these buildings will be further drain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 981

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation RGP

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RGP have been working with the owners of the land at New Monks Farm for many years and during this time numerous meetings have been held with the Highways Agency, (including their consultant representatives), West Sussex County Council and others, as the master plan proposals have evolved. Much data has been collected and robust modelling undertaken to establish all proposals put forward to support the strategic adoption and on-going development of the land and to show that they are technically deliverable, (as well as being appropriate to, and considerate of, the wider network). RGP has agreed with The Highways Agency and West Sussex County Council an in-principle approach to providing access for the development of land at New Monks Farm - the main principles being that access for non-local, car-based traffic would be at the A27, but specifically, it was agreed that the access should be positioned at a location to be decided subject to representations to the Highways Agency, by RGP on behalf of New Monks Farm Development and consultants for Shoreham Airport.

Having analysed and capacity-tested all practical options it was found that the only solution that could meet capacity and safety requirements, as well as maintained the on-going requirements of the wider road network, was an access solution that involved a signalised roundabout to the west of the combined airport and New Monks Farm site frontages - as a result this became RGP's preferred option. Shoreham Airport favoured a main access eastward, generally in place of The Sussex Pad but to date no formal submission has been made to the Highways Agency for technical appraisal, in contrast to RGP's proposal to the west, which has received in-principle technical support from the Highways Agency.

A design premise for a new access at the A27 has from the very beginning of talks been the aspiration of all stakeholders to improve traffic conditions at The Sussex Pad, and also on the section of A27 generally west, up to and including its junction with Busticle Lane.

By a combination of land uses that are complementary, (by encouraging reduced movements, especially by car and locally), well planned non-car infrastructure, and the introduction of Travel Planning initiatives, (including a Community Hub), and additional good access at the A27 for longer distance car travel, it is considered that the development of New Monks Farm and the airport would have a comparatively low reliance on car-based travel.

As of now, by working with stakeholders to develop a joint plan for the regeneration of the airport and the development of New Monks Farm, RGP has prepared an access design that; effectively addresses the identified constraints, accommodates the capacity needs of the development aspirations for both sites, and addresses shortcomings in the condition of safety on the A27 - principally by way of works to the existing Sussex Pad junction.

Against the background of much technical assessment and design iterations, the Highways Agency has agreed to the principle of RGP's design as a safe and convenient means to deliver the development aspirations and improvement to conditions on the A27. In parallel with the work undertaken on behalf of New Monks Farm development, Parsons Brinkerhoff, on behalf of the Highways Agency, has carried out an extensive modelling of the highway network, (principally the A27) - the results of that work has recently been published. Those studies were undertaken independently of RGP's work. Importantly, the input to Parsons Brinkerhoff's work includes allowances for development of New Monks Farm and the airport, and many of its conclusions are shared by those derived from RGP's work. Most notably, against the background of the respective independent work, Parsons Brinkerhoff, has agreed to RGP's access design involving the construction of a signalised roundabout in a westerly position and the conversion of The Sussex Pad with details of its plans for the area, including a cycle-path scheme and the new requirements for a VOSA facility - so these can be considered and included as our agreed access solution moves forward.

Having come to agreement with the Highways Agency in relation to how we best refine the design to optimum standard, and in the absence of any deliverable access alternatives, (as confirmed by the HA at our most recent meeting), RGP will be preparing a pre-planning application consultation for submission to West Sussex County Council and to inform subsequent consultation with the Highways Agency. The outcomes of that consultation will set out a formally agreed scope of works for RGP's Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for a Planning Application and the evolution of associated designs.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 97

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having lived here for 23 years, I have witnessed the roads flooding and each year it seems to get worse - in fact while filling this out. I am watching the water getting higher it is now flooding my front garden. How much worse will it be if the land behind is built on surely, that is the point of a flood plain to drain away excess water after heavy rain or high tides. Unfortunately, the people involved with putting houses on any dual able land will never live there themselves and so won't face the consequences of what will happen.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 980

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

REVISED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2013 FOR ADUR DISTRICT

## STATEMENT BY UK INDEPENDENCE PARTY COUNCILLORS

The Government published a National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 and made it incumbent on Local Authorities to prepare Local Plans consistent with the principles and policies laid out in the National Plan. At the same time, the Government stated that the NPPF was based on projecting the housing needs for the whole country, and was insistent that the varying circumstances within Local Authorities had to be considered when each Local Authority prepared its own Local Plan. Adur Council prepared its own draft Local Plan in Autumn 2012 for housing needs up to 2028 and subsequently revised that Plan to relate to a further 5 years, i.e up to 2031. Adur Planning Committee decided that their Local Plan, though driven by the basic purpose of meeting the suggested housing targets set out by the NPPF, should embrace a range of issues associated with new housing, such as employment possibilities environmental impact, traffic increase, infrastructure needs, such as additional schools, medical facilities, shopping etc, plus the plans already in place for general Regeneration – all these issues were to form a Strong Material Consideration in formulating the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013. This revised draft plan (2013) has now been submitted to Adur residents and local organisations for their views.

We, the undersigned Councillors, have listened carefully to the opinions expressed very strongly at meetings with local residents, and list below a summary of the issues they feel the Planning Committee must take into consideration when finalising the ADUR District Local Plan.

1. The Draft Local Plan is essentially based on a projected housing need of some 3000 dwellings across Adur District for the years up to 2031. These were to be allocated as : 1050 in the Western arm of Shoreham Harbour, up to 600 at New Monks Farm, 480 in West Sompting and 817 “within the built-up area of Adur”. Although the earlier 2012 draft plan had included West Beach (Hasler) in the total housing needed, that area has been excluded from the revised draft plan, meaning that whatever housing had been identified for West Beach must now be absorbed by New Monks Farm/West Sompting.

### 2. THE FLOOD PLAIN.

The issue that without doubt has engendered the strongest feelings locally has been the extraordinary and devastating problems experienced by residents during periods of excessive rainfall. Much of their concern has been attributed to the flood plain levels throughout the locality, with overflowing sewers, flooded homes, flooded roads, etc, Yet this whole matter associated with the flood plain, with all the inevitable suffering inflicted on residents receives scant attention in the Local Plan – a mere 3 lines (Page 16, V9) and one paragraph at the bottom of Page 38 – and this in a document stretching to over 200 pages! The fundamental issue for residents is that if the revised Local Plan is implemented, the additional housing in Lancing and West Sompting would intensify and exacerbate the appalling current realities of flooding – and quite unnecessarily- and all as a result of the Planning Committee’s adherence to National housing targets.

### 3. TRAFFIC CONGESTION.

A further issue of great concern to residents is the suggested building of a new roundabout on the A27 road north of the airport, plus the likely adjustment to the roundabout at the northern end of Grinstead Lane. There are already huge congestion problems in this area, and the additional housing planned will result in even more traffic on all the adjacent areas. When the Brighton Football Club’s Academy becomes fully operational in

2014, the traffic congestion currently experienced at the A27 roundabout and at the Crabtree-Mash Barn Lane junction is bound to be greatly increased.

#### 4. INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES.

The revised Local Plan allocates to the New Monks Farm up to 600 houses over the years leading to 2031, i.e in the region of 140 dwellings per year. But the Plan hardly mentions the fact that the 140 houses planned for New Monks Farm will probably equate to over 400 people. Such a large number of new arrivals will inevitably impact on the facilities currently available to the local residents.

a) More shopping facilities will be needed – there are presently many empty shops in the main Lancing shopping streets, with residents complaining of too many charity shops and not enough “real shops” to satisfy their needs.

b) Residents already have to endure long waits to see a doctor or arrange a hospital appointment – the increase in housing (and therefore more people) will necessitate increased medical facilities to be made available.

c) More housing means more children, so an expansion in either classrooms or new schools will have to be included in a future Local Plan. Provision for such expansion will apply to nursery, primary and secondary educational facilities.

d) More housing means more people, young and old, will need employment, but there is already a lack of employment possibilities in the local area. The Local Plan recognises this problem, but trusts that new employers will come to Lancing and Sompting and be established before the planned newcomers come to inhabit the new houses to be built.

All these developments that will result from the planned housing will require a range of infrastructure features to be available. Many residents do not believe the Planning Committee will allocate to Lancing and Sompting the resources needed.

#### 5. UNDER-USE OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL PREMISES.

The Local Plan envisages developing commercial premises in the area to attract new employers, bringing more trade and investment. Yet there are numerous business sites already existing in the Adur area, many currently under-used. If more sites were developed it would involve more employees coming in from outside the local area, resulting in even more traffic congestion where employees live some distance from their place of employment.

#### 6. FLAWED POPULATION NUMBERS PROJECTED.

One must question the projected housing needs basic to the Local Plan. National predictions based on computer models have been found to be notoriously unreliable, resulting in huge and wasteful expenditure. The Office of National Statistics has recently had to update the predicted UK population for the next decade by several million more people, largely to the ever-growing immigration from both the EU and the Non-EU countries. We ought therefore to mistrust the projected figures that underpin the plan being prepared by our Planning Committee which is designed to meet extremely questionable National targets.

#### 7. THE EFFECT ON WILD LIFE.

The development of the Brighton Football Club site has already had a huge impact on the Wild Life that was indigenous to the Mash Barn estate area, decimating or even eliminating the wide variety of wild life that local residents so enjoyed. The arrival of a new large influx of housing in the vicinity will require vast areas of space, thereby affecting even further the gradual depletion of the animals and plants (and even walking areas) that many residents considered among the greatest attractions of the Lancing and Sompting areas.

#### 8. LOSS OF STRATEGIC GAP (“GREEN SPACE”).

Considerable concern was expressed by residents about the effect that more housing will have on what used to be the Strategic Gap (now called

“Local Green” space”). Several detected in the Local Plan the gradual diminution of the gap between localities, thereby each locality losing its formerly clear identity. They believed the additional housing planned for Lancing and Sompting will have the effect of blurring their separate identities, especially if not enough brownfield sites within each area are not developed and owners of the previously untouched greenfield sites are encouraged by the Local Plan to build houses there.

For all the above reasons, we believe the Revised Draft Plan 2013 is quite unacceptable to the majority of Adur residents. The ADUR Planning Committee must report that the National Planning Policy Framework cannot be implemented in Adur district without massive deleterious effects on the lives of residents.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 99

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I lived for 30 years in New Monks Farm House, I suffer four times flooding. I witnessed the A27 flood three times, each time I receive either ADC, WSCC or Environment Agency / Rivera Authority Action had been taken to prevent it. But each time I flooded. I do not think Adur appreciate how much water does come off the Downs. What ever the developers say, it will Flood Again only time it could affect houses.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 696

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

New Monks Farm - Where is it in relation to Shoreham-by-Sea Airport?

- Concentrate on existing empty housing and retail premises.
- Infrastructure cannot cope.
- We need green spaces for wildlife and recreation.

Need to go back to the drawing boards.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This residents' network wishes to raise the following points and requests that if the policies 5 & 7 remain in the Adur Plan, they wish to be present at the hearing by the government inspector to discuss these points together with those covered in our email of the 8th November 2013.

With information now to hand to do with Mash Barn Lane which is at the heart of the proposed New Monks Farm development, we feel that the following concerns must be raised in connection with the Adur Revised Plan.

In terms of the NMF development we would inform on the following:-

#### Ownership of Mash Barn Lane

It has come to light that NMF Developments are showing on their title plan that the Mash Barn Lane is within their site outline and is owned by them. Residents know that this is a lane which historically has never been owned by anyone. On the transfer and re-registration of the property with the Land Registry, title plans have been conveniently lodged to include this road.

This is being disputed and challenged by our Mash Barn Lane residents. They have a legal right within their deeds to have vehicular and pedestrian access from and to the A27 using Mash Barn Lane.

They are very concerned that this has been overlooked in the planning so far and legally must be preserved as their right, whether the development proceeds or not, and that there is absolutely no change to their method of accessing the A27 using the Mash Barn Lane.

Incomplete/non ownership of Mash Barn Lane which runs, north to south, right through the centre of the proposed development has serious implications for the achievability of the road infrastructure and development generally.

The same 'unidentified lack of ownership' problem occurred with the Albion complex on the southern end of the same lane.

We are concerned that Adur thoroughly checks this out to ensure acceptability of what has been so far submitted.

The residents concerns for future wellbeing are considerable, with particularly both the exclusion or the inclusion of the NMF development. If the NMF proposals are excluded from the plan, will the same developer complete the golf course or leave the public purse to pick up the pieces in terms of restoring the land to its original natural status and for the maintenance of the ditch network which is so crucial to the well being of the area? Whatever the outcome is, this together with the proposal for the airport will be a serious risk to drainage for the whole flood plain area.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS.

#### 1. Policy 5, Policy 7 - Objections

Unacceptable, increased Flood Risk, Decline in Community Wellbeing, Unsustainability

Our message to Adur District Council is absolutely clear.

There must be absolutely no further development on the green areas in the Lancing Shoreham Gap

Of course we recognise the need for an adopted, sound plan for Adur. But, we have had two months' experience of the sheer hell caused by drainage issues last Christmas into New Year.

We wrote and warned of these risks at the last consultation even before that Christmas event.

The management and remedial costs of the Christmas flooding emergency has cost the ratepayers hundreds of thousands of pounds.

For this revised plan even with the known Christmas/New Year drainage disaster, our comments have been completely ignored.

We ask, is this authority happy to let the Christmas experience be repeated as a regular occurrence and with even greater risk to our wellbeing and inevitable damage to our properties and our families' lives ? We are greatly concerned at the proposals in hand.

We know and understand intuitively, better than anyone, the fragility. of the drainage in this highly sensitive area. Just over a metre drainage fall across the two miles of flood plain should say it all.

Old Salts Farm has been excluded from the plan, - and quite rightly so. Even so, whatever is developed in the north on NMF & Airport will still impact the drainage for the whole flood plain area – upstream and downstream. It is all interconnected. Just ask your drainage technical management. Even West Beach and Willowbrook in the south.will be affected. If Old Salts is excluded because of drainage risks, then exactly the same should apply to the NMF and airport developments. If not those areas in the south and all around the plain will still suffer.

#### Issues from the 'Golf Course'

The drainage fall across the unfinished 'golf course' itself (where at least 60% of the NMF development would be located) is 65mm, less than 3 inches across that whole area of 173 acres! (See planning application, Stuart Michael Associates consulting engineer's report, March 2006 – item 3.5). This consultant also highlighted concerns with flood risk to Manor Close to the west of the site. He was certainly correct, as proved by the dreadful Christmas experience and that is after all the 12 mitigation ponds and ditch improvements to the golf course site supposedly should had been done, as required by the planning consent.

Manor Close also had flooding in 2010 as a direct result of lack of ditch clearance on the 'golf course'. Adur drainage engineers had to intervene with the Environment Agency. One of the affected Manor Close residents was refused flood risk insurance as a result of flooding to their property. At that event, there was also water drainage back up upstream to the west with badly water logged gardens.

Studying GPS maps for 2012, there is no trace of the 12 drainage ponds– if not, why on earth not? They were a crucial element in the mitigation for the drainage of the site and to prevent issues for the community locally both up and down stream.

Who is monitoring this development? It has run well over the 5 years of construction projected, has been filled with all sorts of hardcore and rubbish. Does anyone have the data on what volumes/types of fill have been dumped on the site compared to the planning consent?

The land profile has changed dramatically in height but there appears to be no mitigating ponds which were stipulated by the developer's design engineer and approved by the Environment Agency and Adur.

We understand there are also 2 sluices on the perimeter of the site to maintain levels in the ditches in Summer for wild life and which should be lifted in Winter to allow suitable drainage in the wetter season. Who is monitoring this takes place as required by the planning approval?

Why has all this not been stringently monitored in such a sensitive drainage situation?

There is no doubt that lack of mitigation ponds will have been a major contributor to the Christmas issues here in the North.

A flood plain is what it says it is. An area which can be allowed to flood in times of prolonged wet weather. Let alone having permitted already the existing 'golf course' and football complex, the proposed filling of the area with concrete and roads, will create even worse ground water and surface water drainage problems for not only the existing population but, if built, those 600 houses and businesses prospectively planned for the area. Are they viable if they cannot obtain flood risk insurance and are they even saleable. No insurance, no mortgage!

A further concern – next time there is such an event it can only be a lot worse than the one in 2012/2013. Now Southern Water will shortly have sealed all the faulty sewers which were inundated by the Christmas flood event – if such an event is allowed to occur again, there will be no relief possible by pumping the sewers into tankers. And as the Environment Agency have said – you cannot pump ground water, so the issues will be even greater than before.

Even West Sussex County Council's overpumping test from the key ditch which outfalls into the sluices at Shoreham and then into the river Adur using heavy duty fire service pumps made absolutely no impact on drainage levels across the flood plain. This confirms once again that these developments are futile and unmitigatable,

The Environment Agency who has published that a 75% surface and groundwater flood risk applies to these code 3 areas unbelievably has, despite this, indicated that drainage risk can be mitigated for!

This mitigation, we know from a sequential test document which has come to hand, is based upon ratings applied by the EA. Most of NMF is in a 3a area with a high probability of flooding. But this does not take into account the very evident climate change with longer heavier periods of rain. The whole area is already a site at the very highest risk of flooding.

If they had taken into account the severe drainage problems here in Winter 2012/2013, there is no way they could even contemplate mitigation for

surface and groundwater drainage. Water levels were above ground level and no amount of mitigation would have coped as we all know here in North Lancing from the Christmas experience.

The same document also proposed that the areas of less flood risk in the development of the New Monks Farm should be allocated to business development and the areas of greater risk to house and community build! Just how irresponsible is that!

In another part of the UK, the Environment Agency stated that mitigation was in place because of the improved river barrier enhancements at St Asaph in Denbyshire. Earlier this year, two months after moving into the new Taylor Woodrow development, 250 St Asaph homes were under 6 feet of water with Taylor Woodrow whingeing that they were assured by the authorities that it was an area of safe build – despite their ultimate responsibility under planning law.

Last year, another flood plain build at Glasdir also in Denbighshire resulted in 122 homes being flooded with all the local authority blaming poor culvert design and stating that the homes met the Environment Agency specification for floor levels.

In September, Redcar on Teeside experienced serious homes flooding where a 'cure all' super SUDS sewage/surface water containment facility was shown to be totally incapable of coping with just 2 days heavy rain. 60 homes and roads were severely flooded, almost with loss of life.

What recourse do the affected communities have from the authorities or the developers in these situations? None – yet their lives have been ruined because of the negligence of the agencies and authorities responsible.

This is exactly the same situation here in Lancing for all areas in and around the flood plain.

For situations like ours in Adur, our residents have absolutely no confidence in the ability of the agencies/developers to provide the answers - or indeed for SUDS containment to be a proven solution to the drainage problems for this extremely fragile drainage area.

We know and have read that SUDS containment is part of the plan and view this with great alarm. New Monks Farm Development Ltd could not even get the area outline correct for the revised plan. They had included in their site outline a property owned by one of our residents and a recreation park owned by the council on the Mash Barn Estate!

What price they could ever come up with any solution to mitigate the drainage problem??!!

It appears they even have not bothered to build the 12 drainage ponds which were approved and stipulated as being essential for drainage mitigation for the water courses and third parties around it! Their consultant's specification - not the authorities.

Irrespective, with any further building we know there is no foolproof mitigation to guarantee elimination of increased drainage risk to our communities, let alone in the volume proposed.

Issues for the BH&A Complex

It has been noted that quite heavy waterlogging is already taking place on the site where the football training complex is located. This after only intermittent rain over the last few weeks.

As warned by this Network's objections to the extended site application – we feel sure that if the wet weather continues, even the club will have

issues, in fact from what has been noted, it has them already. What price the prospective 600 houses to the North of the club. Yet more proof that they should not be built on this overburdened flood plain which is having trouble coping now – and, although academic, neither for that matter should the football training complex or ‘golf course’ have been permitted in this sensitive drainage area either.

The real impact on the drainage for the area from the club development has yet to be experienced. The data from 5 boreholes across the site to prove the levels of construction to be above the water table have been totally unobtainable to date - from the club, the Environment Agency or the local authority. Why is this information not visible to the public or, does it show that this development is flawed in terms of interrupted flows of the water table across its site?.

As this is being written, West Beach are experiencing the worst flooded roads ever seen by residents and it's worsening. There is only one thing that has changed to affect water flows across the flood plain – the Albion football complex which is now well advanced..

The NPPF says that where there are flood risk areas, other areas should be sought for development. Because of the limitations caused by local geography, we recognise there is limited building space here - a fact which Adur obviously recognises.

It also says that any development initiatives must enhance the wellbeing of the local community. We would like Adur DC to explain just how this is going to improve our situation when regular flooding will become the norm?

Will Adur reduce our council tax or fund our replacements/remedial costs for all the damage and inconvenience caused? We really would like an answer to both these questions.

#### The Christmas Event

We had flooded homes/garages and gardens for weeks all contaminated with sewage. We had loss of toilet facilities – even when things were starting to get under control, at one point you could only flush the toilet literally when the tide was out and surface and ground waters started moving eastwards again!

Many lost gas supplies, particularly on all of Christmas Day. We had tanker lorries often 4 at a time operating in our each of our 4 local streets – 24 hours a day – disruption of sleep was a severe problem for many.

For over 3 months one Manor Close resident had an over pumping unit from the road outside, with heavyweight pipes through their front and rear gardens into a ditch behind where a rear fence section was taken out. These residents suffered greatly and they had only moved into their ‘dream retirement home’ just two months previous to the event.

Other residents had to pump out under floor spaces to prevent rising ground water coming into their home – some were not as lucky and have had insurance claims with the remaining smell to prove it.

And when it was dry enough all these areas had to be cleansed by Southern Water. Many gardens were ruined by loss of bushes and plants which had been submerged under water for so long.

Very few members and Adur executives will have seen the long term devastation in our area caused by an inundated flood plain and A27 over the Christmas event. Below are some of the images of the flooding which our residents in North Lancing experienced for 8 weeks over Christmas into the New Year.

## 2, A27 Objections – Map 7

Unacceptable traffic congestion, increased risk to public safety

We find it totally unbelievable that the Highways Agency is happy with yet another roundabout on the Lancing stretch of the A27 and the increased volume of vehicles from the proposed NMF and airport developments (policies 5 & 7) onto this vital trunk road which is already at over capacity.

7 years ago the HA fought against a 100 homes development for the same area because of the traffic impact on the A27 which overturned the application at a hearing. How on earth can the additional traffic output from 600 homes and 25,000sq m of business development be even considered.

This is pure madness. The only outcome will be gridlock at all times in the day, increased accidents and even more problems for our residents finding it virtually impossible to access the road because of continual traffic flows.

And, to make it even worse, they are prepared to give approval to this roundabout option along the Lancing stretch of this dual carriageway!

We doubt the professionalism of these so called experts. Just think back to last year and the 3 months drainage works pre Christmas on the same stretch and the desperate problems caused because it did not work. They had failed to prove the drainage outfalls as part of the start up plan! They just assumed they would work! We saw the worst flooding ever experienced for this section of the A27.

This proposal would bring absolutely no benefit to Adur and particularly Lancing in terms of the regeneration of the area. It will do exactly the reverse. Companies will avoid investing in the area, people will avoid coming into the area. The A27 is one of the main stumbling blocks to the accessibility of this district – people and companies already avoid it like the plague. With the proposed changes it will create degeneration, not regeneration.

We are totally opposed to the additional roundabout proposed at either the Sussex Pad or just south west of the Withy Patch and this must be excluded from the plan. In the interests of the community and the many thousands of users who already experience the delays which this road causes.

.....

## 3. Wildlife Concerns (Policies 5&7)

In both these areas there is a high level of wild life which use these natural green space areas and drainage ditches as their habitat. Frequently, roe deer are welcomed by residents in the Old Shoreham Road as they even come into their back gardens. There are bats – one of our residents is well versed in these creatures and has batmeter readings which prove their presence across parts of the flood plain area. There are badgers, foxes, invertebrates galore, protected water voles, crested newts (also protected) lapwings (particularly around the policy 7 area), slow worms, grass snakes and innumerable species of birds.

To turn much of this area into building development will decimate the habitat for these much loved indigenous species.

Restricting their presence to a limited bio diverse area behind the Old Shoreham Road will spell the death knell for these creatures. As part of their

requirement to survive, many need to move uninhibited around the total green space which currently exists, already eroded by the Albion complex. Being constricted to just the small 'bio area' mentioned with no chance to roam south or east because a building development is in the way will mean their ability to survive is at great risk.

We must protect this legacy of our natural wildlife for future generations at all costs and not decimate it because of hard nosed, unbalanced government thinking and policies. If nature cannot be protected in its own right – and much of it can, then Adur has the arguments with drainage and infrastructure issues to prevent this damage to the wild life. They must exercise those arguments to the fullest extent.

.....

#### 4. Loss of Green space (Policies 5&7)

Along this coastline the Lancing Shoreham Gap is the only area where the South Downs run virtually down to the sea without any significant coastal urban development.

This proposed building would mean a severe loss of green space for the area both visually and physically. Adur has always managed to preserve this Gap. It's part of the character of the area as much as the airport is an excellent feature.of interest to visitors to the area.

The madness of this government drive to build on green spaces is totally unacceptable. Once again here, Adur must use the strength of the drainage and infrastructure arguments to guarantee that this green space is preserved for the community and future generations.

.....

#### 5. Brownfield Opportunities

We believe that there are far more opportunities for development on brownfield sites in Adur. What about conversion of empty shops and offices which is now possible under current planning policies.

If Adur undertook a really intensive study we believe that the number projected up to 800 homes could potentially rise to take out another 500 homes from the figures they are projecting. That could be the size of the New Monks Farm development.

30% of the Adur community are aged 60+ and this percentage is growing year on year. Older senior citizens will be looking to downsize and in many cases move into care assisted properties which many of the brownfield sites answer the need for. Smaller dwellings with an opportunity to achieve more dwellings with the space available. This would free up family homes which we are told are so much in demand.

We urge the authority to re-examine these other opportunities in the interests of protecting this community.

.....

#### 6. Other Build Opportunities

The NPPF requires neighbouring authorities to liaise and support each other when housing targets cannot be reached.

The biggest opportunity Adur has is to work with the South Downs National Park Authority to agree to permit building on some obvious sites to the north of the A27.

One immediately springs to mind which is not flood plain bound and whilst there would be an impact on the A27, would provide the opportunity for at

least another 4-500 dwellings. This is on the north west quadrant of the A27 intersection at Busticle Lane. This is currently farmland. Any development would still leave a lot of countryside between it and the north part of Sompting to the west without impinging on the sanity of that village.

The other is the cement works. The South Downs Authority and Horsham should be urged to allow development there to assist Adur with its housing numbers.

We urge Adur to vigorously pursue these with the SDNPA and Horsham.

Lidl are canvassing support for a store in Brighton Road Shoreham. The site is at least an acre – ideal for Adur to start rebuilding its council owned housing stock on a brownfield site. We need more supermarkets like ‘a hole in the head’ – but we do need more houses.

Also, if the Mayfield development being discussed to the west of the A23 does come to fruition, is this not the salvation we have been looking for?

We feel these opportunities must be pursued vigorously to endeavour to reduce the levels of build in this highly space restricted district.

.....

In summary, Lancing Manor SE Residents’ Network is asking the elected councillors of Adur District Council to have the courage to take the right action to protect the wellbeing of all its residents – there must be no further building development on the Lancing Shoreham Gap. Adur must have the will to defend that vigorously and conclusively to take care of its rate paying community.

---

Map/Para/Policy:	Policy 05: New Monks Farm	Reference No.	694
Relates To Map <input type="checkbox"/>	Relates To Paragraph <input type="checkbox"/>	Relates to Policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Organisation
Comments	Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Object <input type="checkbox"/>	Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			Agent's Organisation

We are very concerned that if this land is built on with little regard to drainage of water coming down from the Downs, the flooding problem on West Beach Estate (ex Hasler Estate) will get worse. This is already a serious issue as on 6th November 2013, it was impossible to walk back to our house without going ankle deep in water. It was completely across the road and the pavements.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 699

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As a supporter of Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network, I would like to raise my concerns about the proposed major development on New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport.

As a resident living on the north side of the proposed development site, I have experienced the consequences of prolonged wet weather causing gas and sewer problems. If this plan is given the go ahead, where is all the excess water going to go? The wetland is there for a purpose, to retain the flood water during periods of heavy rain. The consequences will be disasterous if part of the flood plain is covered in concrete to build homes, a school, a community centre and 10,000 square metres of business development.

The A27 cannot cope now. The extra traffic that the development will generate would create absolute gridlock. Six years ago the Highways Agency objected to a proposal to build 100 homes on the land at the end of Manor Close because of increased traffic onto the A27. Surely they would be against the new development of up to 600 homes for the same reason.

Please consider the points raised in this letter when making a decision about this inappropriate proposed development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 700

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: Local Plan.

I have recently seen the local plan where there is a proposal to build 1000 new homes in the Lancing/Sompting area. I wondered if anybody had given this proposal some serious thought about the practicalities and consequences of such a large development; or is the proposal just blindly going along with central government guidelines.

The area already suffers from chaotic gridlock at morning and evening peak times. Weekends also have their chaotic periods.

To increase the housing stock by this scale will require serious improvement to traffic flow through the area - a bypass would be the only real option.

Also, look at the destruction in recent years through flooding in areas where development has been carried out on flood plains. Do we really want the same problem to arise in our area?

I would hope that the local council will reject the proposals outright.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Comments as above, there are bridleways directly north of the A27, to which all non-motorised users (NMUs) should have safe access. WSLAF has been in discussion with the Highways Agency regarding NMU crossings of the A27 and would be happy to share our knowledge and expertise with Adur DC Officers.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are pleased to see commitment to ensure safe and improved pedestrian and cycle access across the A27 to the SDNP, but disappointed that there is no reference to equestrianism which is local and part of the rural economy. Equestrians also need safe and improved access across the A27 to the SDNP as at present many use horseboxes and trailers to cross the road, which does not aid sustainability or pollution.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 701

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

West Street is already grossly overused for a tiny village street as the vast majority of people using the A27, cut through Church Lane and West Street at pea times. This causes pollution, severe congestion and it makes it very difficult to leave or enter our properties in the car. It is already a dangerous road for our four year old daughter to walk along, and the proposed 480 more houses in the area would mean a possible 1440 more cars using this already busy street.

The local schools are already very over-subscribed and having a huge addition of local residents would have a hugely negative impact to educational provisions.

This area is already a problem in regards to traffic, noise and pollution and it simply cannot take a further addition of people and cars.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 702

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing with reference to plans for building 450 houses on the 'in fill' area, between the A27 and Coast Road.

My objections are on the roads to service the extra homes. The A27 is a nightmare, and successive governments have refused to finance the promised Trunk road, first proposed in the 1970s.

My second objection is the use of the flood plain.

Thirdly is the number of school places of which are all currently filled.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 975

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation New Monks Farm Development Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Enplan UK Ltd

SEE EMAILS FOR ATTACHMENTS

RD Policy 5 New Monks Farm and Map 4

We generally support the policy (see below regarding Map 4) and the range of proposed development uses including:

- 450 - 600 houses,
- A neighbourhood centre/community hub,
- A new school (see concerns/comments below),
- 10,000sqm of employment generating uses,
- Suitable access onto the A27 ,
- Provision or funding for off-site traffic impacts,
- Provision of sustainable transport infrastructure,
- Site specific travel behaviour initiatives/travel plan proposals.

However, we have the following concerns/comments to make on the Policy:

1. Improving the access across the A27 to the South Downs National Park for pedestrians and cyclists is only supported if this is a viable and deliverable development option.
2. The costs of the new roundabout to the A27 and pedestrian road crossing which total circa £4.25m, can be funded by the proposed development however we would expect additional and supporting funding to be forthcoming from various stakeholders and agencies.
3. Whilst we have no objection to providing a Landscape/Green Infrastructure Strategy - this is referenced in the policy with limited, if any, mention of it within the supporting text. Our concerns/comments and objections are as follows:

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 2012 for the site states that it is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory nature conservation designations. It does however, state that construction works that may result in the loss of, or other impacts on the north-west section of the site, scrub/tree-lines along Mash Barn Lane and the network of ditches (and associated riparian habitats) is avoided. These habitats should be retained and protected, except where loss is unavoidable, and only after an appropriate programme of mitigation, compensation and enhancement has been put in place. As there are no statutory or designated sites within the development area, we are concerned that this part of the policy is not clear about those elements that are to be protected and/or enhanced and why. Para 2.57 within the RDLP 2013 states that the most important biodiversity habitats are the network of streams and ditches. We only support therefore reference to the streams and ditches being safeguarded and enhanced.

4. We assume the Council's standards for sports and recreation is that set out in the Infrastructure Guidance 2013. We consider it is appropriate

that some of the formal sports/recreational requirement could potentially be located within the Country Park in order to introduce flexibility to the overall development.

5. We object to the reference to development respecting the landscape of the Lancing-Shoreham by Sea Local Green Gap (see below). The essence of a Green Gap (of which we object to anyway) is to prevent towns coalescing. It is not a landscape based policy.

6. Whilst we support a school being located at NMF, this is subject to the Council proving the need for it, how it will be funded and importantly, how and when it will be delivered.

7. We object to the current wording of 'a Country Park and informal recreation' and request that this is amended to 'a Country Park, informal and potentially formal recreation'. The Council should note that an allocation of formal recreation use within the Country Park would help to generate funds towards the on-going maintenance and management of the Park.

With regard to Map 4 that accompanies RD Policy 5, this shows an incorrect access from the A27 into the site. The correct masterplan is attached. In addition, we have the following comments/objections:

- We object the proposed siting of the school being annotated on the Map. This is not based on any technical work and may in reality not be an appropriate place for a school (in proximity to a professional football training ground for example)
- We object to the area of ecological enhancement being identified on the plan.
- It is considered that the whole site including the Country Park be shown as the strategic allocation in one colour and the development area shown in a separate annotation.
- The reference to Country Park in the key should also include the words "potentially formal recreation uses".

#### Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

We are concerned about some of the references within the SA to NMF and RD Policy 5. We object to the references to the Local Green Gap. The summary from the SA within the Draft Local Plan at para 2.66 is misleading as there are no historic environment issues regarding this site. In addition, we object to any references to a joint access onto the A27 with the airport. We also object to any concerns from a landscape point of view to developing the site.

In conclusion, we are in general support of the Local Plan and Policy 5 New Monks Farm. We consider that NMF is a deliverable strategic allocation. We would welcome a meeting with you to discuss our comments and proposed changes to the Local Plan in more detail.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 706

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We object to building on New Monk Farm.

All of this area is on a flood plain and flooding has got worse over the last 7 years. More building will increase the flooding and West Beach Estate is the lowest point, therefore it will be affected the most.

The new football complex is on the hill above us and we do not know yet what effect that will have on flooding. We are happy on the estate but we fear for our property.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 707

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Our first and major concern is the fact that there is even a proposal to build on a flood plain. After many years of the Environment Agency rejecting plans for building on this particular flood plain, what has changed? Have provisions been made to stop/divert the flooding? With even more houses being built, there is the potential for even more homes to be affected by the flood damage. The drains are unable to cope with the amount of water flowing through them as was seen quite clearly and devastatingly last winter.

The A27 is unable to cope with the volume of traffic travelling along it at the moment. By adding another 600 houses to the mix, with the potential of at least 1500 cars, the traffic congestion will be increased. Therefore, the amount of pollution will also increase.

We understand that a new school is to be built to cater for new children in the area, but what provisions have been made for doctors and dentists? To make an appointment at our doctor's surgery, they require a notice of at least 10 days! With even more potential patients, one will have to book it at least a month in advance!

Although I'm sure that some of these extra residents will have jobs, if there are to be family homes, there will also be a number of people potentially requiring part-time jobs. Therefore, there will be an increase in applications for the same number of positions.

Please reconsider building on New Monks Farm - surely there are pockets of land that would be more suitable to build on?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 708

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 3 - Huge loss of green gap.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 507

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With reference to the Mind the Gap survey my answer is that

Any building of property on the land in the surrounding area would be detrimental to the area because of the flooding which has proven traumatic for a lot of people in the roads around the proposed site, some more than others due to raw sewage actual internal ingress to bungalows, Which has become worse since the site fill for what is supposed to have been a golf course has since been overfilled, this was always a natural flood plain drain off point and by building / banking all the earth there this has made the flooding many times worse than before by diverting surface water westwards towards manor close and surround properties

There is also the wildlife to consider as the fields within the planned works are all natural breeding and feeding grounds for various creatures including Deer, Badger, Rabbit, Foxes and Ducks along with some birds i.e. Sparrow hawk, Kestrel and Woodpecker along with Jays and some others.

My other concern would be the idea of extra traffic along the A27 and Grinstead lane, these two roads alone are heavy with traffic at any time of day but adding more at peak times could and would be totally chaotic and cause even more delays than at present but then only someone who lives in this area would see and understand this. Besides the above I feel that we need the strategic gap as a part of the natural break between the villages and towns

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 848

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 870

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Planning Dept

I live on Grinstead Lane in Lancing and am very concerned regarding the proposals made for the reasons set out below:

Grinstead Lane is far too busy, heavy traffic including big HGVs all day long. This can only get worse due to more traffic in general, therefore more pollution, more noise. This is unavoidable.

However, to build 600 houses, a school and a community centre, and more besides, is going to cause far more traffic. 600 houses will use a minimum 600 cars, just look at Grinstead Lane-many have 2, some have 3 cars per home, Why should the new residents be any different? You can't make people walk, cycle or use the bus. So the surrounding area, including my road, Grinstead Lane, will be unbearably noisy with traffic pollution, ultimately causing poor health.

This is enough of a reason to change the proposal and desist from building. Nonetheless, there is another even more worrying issue to do with risk of increased flooding of the area flanked by Grinstead Lane, A27, the River Adur and the sea.

According to the Environment Agency, the area flanked by Grinstead Lane, A27, the River Adur and the sea are "an area at higher risk of flooding based on our records and prediction of likely flooding". We know this is a real threat, look back to last Christmas, Grinstead Lane flooded from Curvins Way to A27, Manor Way flooded with tankers outside emptying the drains for many days, gas pipes eroded in floodwater, Gas workers digging up a flooded road on Christmas Day.

It has been worse, in 2001 there was flooding for over 2 months on Grinstead Lane and Manor Way area. The people of West Beach (South Lancing) have only just earlier this week had their road flooded. So WE know the Enviroment Agency are not exaggerating, does the local council think they are? If 600 houses, a school and a community centre are built on a floodplain then we will really find out how bad it can get. Will the Council help us all,( I mean 'all' as in the area mentioned above which will include the 600 houses, a school and a community centre) with our damaged properties and house insurance problems which are bound to arise? In any case, why would anyone want to live on a floodplain (New Monks Farm).

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 917

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am completely opposed to the elements in the Adur Strategic Plan noted as Policies 5, 7 and Map 7.

How on earth can the Environment Agency say that flood risk can be mitigated for the New Monks Farm proposed development after last Christmas's 8 weeks of devastation to this area in North Lancing? This agency was party to dealing with this extreme crisis together with all the other agencies and local authorities.

This is a grade 3 flood area and must never be built on further for either the wellbeing of existing residents who know what it is to be affected by severe drainage and sewage issues, let alone any proposed new builds who will be lucky to even get insurance.

Over last Christmas, I was on a BBC TV South's main news item pumping out floodwater from under my floorboards. Surely such images are enough to persuade Adur and its councillors just how neglectful it is to even propose such development. They have a duty of care to the rate paying community which by publication of this draft, they have totally failed to observe.

Adur District Council has no option but to exclude the New Monks Farm and airport developments from the plan. I, as a resident demand it, the local community here demand it. They must never allow a repeat of another event like residents suffered at the start of 2013.

I live on the A27. What world do these professionals at the Highways Agency live in? Some years ago they objected to a 100 homes development behind where I live because of the traffic effect on the A27, now they are happy to approve the significant additional traffic volume from 600 homes, a school and business developments on the same site??!! Furthermore, they are happy with an additional roundabout on this already over capacity trunk road. I need say no more but just look at the same road around Chichester.

I personally have no faith in this agency, particularly after the so called drainage improvement works for 3 months running up to last Christmas. The outcome as we all know was the worst flooding ever experienced along the Lancing stretch of the A27!

This development on the A27 must never be allowed – it is illogical, it will cause gridlock, it will cause accidents and it certainly will not promote the regeneration of this area, more likely the degeneration of Lancing.

Adur District Council must exclude any further development on the Lancing – Shoreham Gap and in the interests of our well being strenuously defend their action to the government inspectorate.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 864

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have no idea which Map/Paragraph/Policy number my comments below refer to. My comments are a heartfelt and overall observation. The A27 and A259 are so often congested with traffic through from Shoreham to Arundel, particularly in the summer months that more housing in this area will greatly add to this major infrastructure problem. Additional population and car use into the area would be a considerable drain on all the emergency services and probably local schools. Regeneration to Lancing is urgently needed, along the lines of Shoreham and updating public transport and roads, before Adur Council should consider more housing being built. Unless the plan includes the house building contractors to provide these before commencing additional houses on such a large scale.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 918

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Summit Planning Associates

To further support comments made in relation to draft policy 10 and in response to draft policy 5, we would also seek to submit outline details of a site located on the edge of Sompting village, which demonstrates that a site could be brought forward for residential development, without compromising the character of the village or its countryside location in the Local Green Gap.

The site is identifiable as Stocks Gardens, located at the eastern end of West Street and accessed from near to the junction of West Street/ Church Lane. The full extent of the site ownership is indicated on the Plan on the continued sheet. The full site size is in the order of approximately 1.8ha although it is not proposed that the entirety of the site would be developed for residential development.

In considering the principle of development at this site regard has been given to the fact that it is a greenfield site outside of the Built Up Area Boundary. Having regard to the pattern and footprint of built development on Church Lane, from the junction with West Street (following a south to north pattern), it is anticipated that a corresponding form of development could be provided at this site, following a north to south pattern. It is considered that this would preserve the character of Sompting village itself, would serve to maintain the separate identity of Sompting village, would not compromise its countryside location and would not lead to the coalescence of settlements. This would also not undermine draft policy 2 which seeks to respect and maintain the character of Sompting village.

Also, in having had regard to the footprint and pattern of development on Church Lane close to the junction with West Street, it is anticipated that in the order of 15-20 dwellings per hectare would be an acceptable density in this location.

The principle of residential development in this location would not be contrary to policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, which fundamentally seeks to promote sustainable development in the rural areas and to avoid new isolated homes in the countryside. Furthermore, the development of this site would contribute to the delivery of the objectively assessed housing need for the Adur area, which the Local Planning Authority acknowledges is unlikely to be achieved, given other strategic and physical constraints that the District is subject to. The site is available, developable and deliverable and can therefore make a realistic contribution to the overall delivery of the Districts objectively assessed strategic housing need.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 863

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having attended the meeting at the Lancing Parish hall, we would like to object to the proposed development of the area at the back of the Mash Barn Estate and Sompting for the following reasons.

- The current roadway cannot take the amount of traffic that currently runs through lancing and the manor roundabout is extremely dangerous and difficult to negotiate especially from the North and south of lancing. More development in this area will make this even more of a nightmare than it is already.
  - Flood risk and the fact it is a flood plain make no sense what so ever to build on this area, Having already been affected by the flood disruption we do not want it to be made worse. The environment agency and the planning people all accepted this to be a major problem and it makes no common sense to build in an area like this. Not only could it cause more flood issues in this area but from an insurance point of view any insurance company would be opposed to covering buildings at such risk.
  - We also do not see the need for more industrial units to be built when half of the Churchill industrial estate sits empty with to let signs everywhere.
  - Sompting development will cause more traffic issues where it is used as a rat run anyway and regularly gridlocks during peak times.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 856

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

### Objections for the proposed developments

My objections for the proposed developments of the Lancing, Sompting area are based on the quality of life for the present and future residents of any new developments.

Today the traffic congestion, in and around the area, is some of the worst in the country. Travelling to and from work, on any day when there isn't an accident or road works, is bad enough without the additional traffic and saturation of a possible thousand new vehicles in and around the development of Lancing and Sompting.

At present, the whole of the south coast is just one large, over-developed conurbation, with very little natural green spaces between; building on the few green spaces left should be prohibited.

It is realised by most people that there is a need for more "affordable housing" however more consideration to the location of such proposed developments should be given greater consideration. Using brown sites instead of taking more green sites away should be the priority.

As a volunteer ambulance car driver, I am very aware just how over stretched the NHS has become. I take patients from the whole of West Sussex to Brighton or Haywards Heath for their treatments because Worthing, Shoreham or Chichester NHS Trust cannot provide for them, which is distressing enough, without adding to the problems of additional traffic.

A dialysis patient typically needs a four hour session three times a week. If you live West of Worthing and travel three times a week to Brighton, and it takes hours to be transported to and from the hospital, it becomes a wretched form of existence. Please don't make it any worse!

It's a similar case for cancer patients, who must travel to Brighton for radio-therapy because Worthing and other hospitals, which are part of the same trust, are unable to provide appropriate treatment. The frustration and stress already endured by these unfortunate people will be exasperated with further congestion.

As a final and salient point, the council must have noticed that there are only west or east traffic main highways into and out of Worthing, Sompting and Lancing areas. The absence of north or south roads makes the area a geographical bottle neck of traffic, which at specific times of the day, consistently throughout the year, maintains a state of grid lock for the whole area.

How might anything up to one thousand extra cars propose to alleviate this problem or enhance the quality of life for the present or future residents or your voters?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 921

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As a resident who lives north of the flood plain I would like to object to the planning applications for the New Monks Farm development, Policy 5 and also the Airport development, Policy 7.

Over the Christmas period we experienced 8 weeks of flooding, loss of sewage & gas supplies, having lived in Manor Close for over twenty years I can assure you this is not the first time this has happened, on many occasions we have had to endure pumps in our road for weeks on end, we feel that the draft plan has neglected to take this into account.

Building up to 600 houses with a community centre, school and 10,000 sq metres of business development plus the road infrastructure will only increase the on going flood risk in this area, this land must be allowed to work as a flood plain to retain excess water during periods of wet weather. As a side note I would like to add that our house insurance renewal which we received this month is almost £1000 which is a 400% increase on last year, this is due to the flooding problems over the winter. I wonder how the new residents of this potential development will react when they realise the costs involved in insuring their homes built on a flood plain.

I am well aware that local government is under pressure to build houses, but to build on an area that has been and still is at great risk of flooding is difficult to understand, drainage problems in this area are still to be addressed.

Also this particular stretch of the A27 between the Shoreham flyover and the Grove lodge roundabout in Worthing is notorious for heavy traffic and long delays, to add to this by creating a further possible 1,200 cars is very worrying, we travel every morning from our home to the grove lodge roundabout which is 3 miles. This short journey takes on average 30 minutes, if we take the bus this journey is then 50 minutes. Also by replacing the traffic lights at the Sussex Pad with a roundabout (Map 7) this will increase the problems for us accessing the A27 due to no break in the traffic.

In the interests of all the residents in Lancing, there must be no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain, and I hope that Adur District Council defends this argument with the government inspectors.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 854

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 932

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 853

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 269

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to New Monks Farm, Lancing development:

- A development of this size cannot be considered until a BYPASS is completed.

- The plan has not addressed the major A27 issues to the west at Lyons Farm junction and beyond

- And nearby to the development no indicative proposals to North Lancing roundabout. Only mitigation measures are mentioned for the roundabout. The east, south and west junction cannot be widened so you're left with traffic light management which will cause blight to the local residents with longer queues forming down Grinstead Lane. The east junction compounded by more cars coming from New Monk's development.

- The proposal to have a another new roundabout to access New Monk's Farm from the A27 would create even more start stop traffic through this stretch of the A27 to the detriment of A27 traffic flow and to the residents along the A27. Not really a good option except maybe west filter off the development but this would almost certainly mean new Monk's residents doing a 180 to go east. If Grinstead lane is out of question then. A feeder road parallel to the A27 is the only option with improvements at Sussex Pad junction. However I object to this development going ahead until a Bypass is designed and built that excludes the section of A27 from the Sussex Pad to the West of Durrington.

- The development itself as proposed will only allow vehicular access from the A27. So that's the only way in and out for residents apart from bus pedestrian and cycle accesses onto Mash Barn estate. This will not be good for Lancing supermarkets and local shops. Residents will go elsewhere to shop and smaller purchase that may have been found in Lancing will be picked up where the residents choose shop, e.g. Holmbush and Lyons Farm.

- Clause 2.61 states 'the site is predominantly located in flood zone 3a (high probability) with parts in flood zone 1 (low probability) and 2 (medium probability). Parts of the site are at risk from surface water flooding, particularly the northern section, and the site is also susceptible to ground water flooding. .... Opportunities should be sought to improve flood risk elsewhere where possible'.

This clause explains the difficult nature of land and the last sentence clearly indicates the problems of flooding currently experienced by housing off the south side of the A27. So with this development taking away large area of land that can absorb groundwater and some surface water the development seems to jeopardise the areas ability to deal with prevailing environmental condition.

Further the East Worthing treatment works at times has been overwhelmed at times in the past in backing up sewers into Worthing Hospital and flooding local residents near the works, indicates that it is not able to cope with inclement heavy rain conditions. Can the sewers and treatment works cope with extra household and 'retained' capacity proposed? The major expansion Adur Local Plan is proposing to add to the works is surely not the only new developments the treatment works will have to plan for. What extra developments will come from Worthing's between now and 2031?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 924

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am a resident living north of the flood plain and wish to strongly object to the planning applications for New Monks Farm development, Policy 5 and also Policy 7 the Airport development.

I cannot understand how these policies can be countenanced, especially after 8 weeks of flooding, loss of sewerage and gas experienced by Lancing residents last Christmas and New Year.

The draft plan has conveniently neglected to take account of this and the thousands of pounds spent attempting to rectify all the problems, indeed some of the work is still ongoing. I have lived in Manor Close for some 20 odd years and on many occasions tankers have had to be employed continuously to deal with water problems when rainfall is heavy. In view of the fact that the flood plain is so shallow, it seems to me to be sheer madness to go ahead with these policies, thereby further exacerbating an already existing problem. It will put all residents within this area at risk of further severe flooding and disruption.

I know the council is under pressure from the Government to build more houses but surely not to the detriment of existing rate payers.

The traffic on the A27 is already over capacity and since the building of the new college at Grove Lodge is even more notorious for causing very long delays. More cars from more properties would further increase delays, and replacing traffic lights with a roundabout means there would be continual traffic flow making it very difficult for me to access the A27 (Map 7). I understand that 7 years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected mainly because of objections by the Highways Agency, so how can the road suddenly be capable of sustaining vastly increased traffic now?

There must be no more building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District must listen to residents concerns and defend our arguments to government inspectors.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 847

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Old Shoreham Road Surgery

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear ADC,

I wish to voice my strong objections to the proposed developments within the Lancing Gap [policies 5 and 7] as suggested in the Adur Draft Plan.

I write as a person who has lived and worked in the same premises in Lancing for over 50 years. I have seen the recent flooding episodes in this locality but can also recall much worse flooding in the early 60s when much more of the ground was under water for longer periods of time.

Speaking as a GP[my own business] the possibility of increased population around the surgery is attractive for increasing our trade[income] BUT common sense says building further on a flood plain is a complete "no-brainer" and should not go ahead. Various development proposals for the area of land at the end of Manor Close have been refused in the past on the grounds of poor drainage and the likelihood of increased flooding coupled with the difficulty of access onto the A27. The present proposal by dint of size is much more likely to cause significant flooding problems to existing residential areas as well as to the new build areas. A flood plain is just that.....an area that is prone to flood. I do not think we do any service to those wanting housing to give it to them in an area where it is very likely to become flooded. And it certainly does not help those in existing houses dependent on the efficient drainage across the flood plain as it will add to the "water load" on the plain making a precarious situation worse and flooding more likely. Coupled with the distress and disruption flooding causes to individual residents is the cost [to the local taxpayer] of dealing with the effects. This must be added to the equation too.

Leaving aside the flooding issue, access onto, and traffic flow along, the A27 is already very difficult at peak hours and this can only be made significantly worse if there are several hundred more dwellings, and a significant amount of businesses, to feed into it. I think this will be much worse if a school is involved too. [It is very noticeable how much easier it is getting into work along the local feeder roads when the schools are on holiday] As a health professional, I have great worries as to the long term effect on the wellbeing of residents of the increased emissions of, even more, near stationary traffic. There is also the very real risk of increased accidents where local traffic is trying to join the through traffic.

For all these reasons the proposal to build in the gap on the flood plain must be firmly resisted. Whilst I appreciate the pressures on local authorities from central government to fulfil their quotas of new build housing, nobody is helped by palpably wrong decisions. The Gap is not the place for more development and ADC must reject these proposals and look at less damaging ones, defending their decisions firmly to central government if needed.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 925

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are writing to object in the strongest possible way to the Adur Plan with the proposal to build 600 houses on the flood plain between Lancing and Shoreham.

My wife and I, along with all the residents in Manor Way, Old Shoreham Road, Manor Close, Grinstead Lane and even properties on the Mash Barn Lane on the New Monks Farm site itself suffered unacceptable problems over two months during the Christmas 2012 and into the New Year.

Why is it that the area you propose to build all these houses on is recognised as a FLOOD PLAIN by everyone including yourselves, so having accepted this how can you in the remotest possible way even suggest that this plan can go ahead.

B&H Albion was granted planning permission for their academy, with the assurances that this will not have any affect on the flooding problems. This is yet to be proved. Just suppose, because of the concreting that the buildings and car park of the academy needs to have, this leads to any increase in the flooding problems in all the above roads.

What will you be able to do about this? I will tell you NOTHING. Because the damage has already been done with your blessing, against the wishes of the residents that you are supposed to represent.

Now you want to do the same again! Where on earth is your justification for this? We realise that you have been actioned to build a certain amount of houses by the government and even those numbers are questionable and need re-examination, but you just cannot disregard the people you represent and just knowingly condemn them to more misery.

As for the proposals for the A27 (map 7) and another roundabout, words absolutely fail us!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 846

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 926

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The road through Sompting Village can, at best, be described as a glorified dirt track, as it has been for many years. The Sompting by-pass was built to 'by-pass Sompting' but in the rush hour, or with even the slightest mishap on the A27, Sompting is swamped with the rat-runners and those too impatient to wait to get through the traffic lights and join a single carriageway, a result of years of traffic mis-management of the A27. So, with this already being the case, how do you propose to accommodate the great influx of cars with a 480 house development in the village? You cannot 'improve' (your word on the display panel in the Harriet Johnson Centre) something that is not there to improve? The mini roundabout by the Marquis of Granby has not been repaired since last winter; if you cannot even repair the road, how can you improve it?

Forcing even more people into a small rural village with an already inadequate road system is an accident waiting to happen.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 927

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

What action is to be taken to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed 480 homes in Sompting? As anyone who uses the A27 in the rush hour will tell you, it cannot cope with any more traffic. You are proposing to put one thousand homes right next to the A27. At peak times the traffic from Shoreham Airport to Lancing Manor is at best a crawl. The traffic at Lyons Farm causes tailbacks to Church Lane before you get to the Grove Lodge Roundabout. Previously just awful, the imposition of Worthing College has turned the whole area into a nightmare. Traffic is terrible now and you want to make it considerably worse.

West Street is already jammed in the rush hour by people using it as a rat run to avoid Lyons Farm, due to the inadequacy of traffic management. How does traffic generated by an additional 480 homes tie in with your commitment to preserve the character of Sompting Village.

Busticle Lane frequently has traffic queued as far back as the Ball Tree Surgery. Grinstead Lane frequently had traffic queued back to Mash Barn Lane.

These are all areas that need urgent action now, not the imposition of this development that can only bring more gridlock to the area. I suggest that logic be used. First upgrade the A27 to cope with traffic demands and then build more homes. Not the other way around.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 928

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 930

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 820

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Regarding the development on the flood plain.

When we had the floods here Christmas time, the environment inspector said property should never be built on the flood plains.

We've had some distressing times with floods and sewer problems.

The Highways Agency was against the last threat to building, due to the extra volume struggle and that was for 100 properties. Seven years on and the volume struggle has not improved, just gets worse.

Lancing village have a number of empty shops, certainly do need anymore business premises.

There is a lot of wildlife in these fields, they will take their homes.

Wildlife is important, as is their habitat.

P.S. Please take note of the environment inspector and the Highway Agency.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 922

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having attended the meeting on 26th Oct at Sompting School one of the many concerns raised was the huge impact on the potential traffic increase: West Street & Lyons Farm being a nightmare at all times.

Next was the strain on the schools, doctors and dentists.

Concerns about flooding risk not to new ones, but to existing ones: who will accept liability in event of future flooding to these existing properties???

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear All

I have lived at the extreme west end of West Way for very nearly 17 years and the one thing that we were always thankful for was that we didn't get the water welling up through the concrete as it does further down the road. We have had standing water when a heavy or continuous rain event meant that the soakaways could not cope, but that has always gradually subsided within a few hours.

We went out about 1.30pm today and our end of West Way was dry as usual. Further down the road we drove through the worst flooding that I have ever seen with Bristol Avenue flooded right to the far end. The other side roads also have a great deal of water, apart from West Avenue which usually escapes.

When we returned just after 2.30pm we were shocked to see the water welling up between the concrete slabs in the circle. This has NEVER happened before and it shows a worrying change to the flood issues on West Beach Estate. Just in case someone wants to explain this away, I will put in 3 that I think will spring to mind and counter the first two with an irrefutable answer:

- 1) I am aware that we are in the midst of one of the highest high tides of this year, but these occur at some point every year and have never come up in the circle in the (nearly) 17 years I have lived here.
- 2) We need the soakaways to be rodded but they have not suddenly become significantly more blocked than they were a few weeks/months ago. We have had standing water before but only excess rain from above, not water welling up from under the ground.
- 3) The only thing that has happened recently that has never happened before is the interference with the surface of the flood plain by Brighton & Hove Albion.

Once water has forced a route through somewhere it will always find its way there again. This was proved by the floods in Chichester in 1994 when the water that did not run through the city followed its ancient course east of Chichester south to the sea. So, we are now in a position that flood water could be a feature of the west end of West Way where it has never been seen before. If you download photo 3 above in particular, you can see the ripples from the water rising from below the concrete. Photo 4 above shows the extent of the water across whole circle.

Southern Water is due here tomorrow to start the permanent repair of the road where the sewer burst last July. They have also to repair our side of the circle (see photo below and photos 1 & 2 above) because their machines damaged that when they were mending the sewer. We are concerned that they will not be able to start the work because of the water that is still coming up through the concrete.

I will welcome any responses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 34

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Councillors and Adur Directors,

Currently West Beach has the worst road flooding ever as witnessed by residents. Please see the two video links below.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IkcsanKccqQ>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KddHWiucaPc>

“Please stress that the flooding will be catastrophic for West Beach if any more development on the flood plain is agreed. We are certain that the thousands of tons of aggregate dumped on the golf course and the massive construction at BHAFC including 11 football pitches has compromised the function of the flood plain displacing the water south to West Beach. Also the much improved drainage of the A27 and the watercourses on the north flood plain is increasing the water flow to the south flood plain which is waterlogged and has blocked/restricted watercourses”

Once again, the community sincerely hopes that the elected members and officers will take heed of this, yet another warning that flood plain building bears a high risk. With the proposed New Monks Farm & Airport developments of 600 homes/25,000 sq m of business development, the community as a whole dreads to think of the disasters which will befall West Beach and the area of Lancing generally.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear All,

Here's another good reason why never to build on a flood plain. Please see today's BBC report in the link.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-north-east-wales-24810900>

The salient points from the story of the Glasdir Estate in Wales have been picked out. There are some very telling sentences here which is why these paragraphs have been selected. Never mind where the flooding occurs, the issues are true of any homes built on flood plains anywhere in the UK. Adur District Councillors should 'read, mark, learn and inwardly digest' and then pass on the facts to Government if they are challenged about why they should not build on flood plains.

There are other cases as I mentioned at the cabinet meeting, Redcar in September, St Asaph, also in Denbighshire to name but two others. Adur must use these examples to protect the community from similar disasters.

Once again, New Monks Farm and the Airport are on a flood plain – Adur must exclude these from the plan

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

1. I have spoken to my GP at the "Ball Tree Surgery" firstly he was unaware of the draft plan and secondly he stated that the practice was at maximum capacity and could not take on any more doctors as they haven't the space. The practice has no contingency plans in place as it has not been consulted at this stage. It has taken up to two weeks for me to get an appointment to see my own GP.
2. Worthing hospital seems to be at full capacity with even disabled patients finding it near impossible to park. The last time I had an appointment there I had to park at the Splashpoint leisure centre.
3. Sir Robert Woodard Academy is presently at maximum capacity and will have to make provisions for the extra intake of the 11 year olds.
4. Secondary pupils from the "West Sompting" development will have to go to East Worthing school creating increased traffic flow along West Street at peak times, and, if cycling, put themselves at risk on a busy and narrow road.
5. Sompting Village Primary school seems to also be at maximum capacity and I can see no provision for an extra primary school in the plans.
6.  The emergency services complain that they can't use West Street in response to emergencies due to the congestion and have to use the A27.
7. The A27 is already very congested and the development of the old Norwich Union site has only added to this problem.
8. With West Street acting as a pressure release valve for the A27 it takes considerably more traffic than it should and regularly comes to a complete halt for significant lengths of time.
9. The local bus service has been drastically reduced with no service at all covering West Street and the local area on Sundays or after 7pm.
10. The Lancing/Shoreham/Steyping learning partnership area has the lowest proportion of school leavers continuing into learning and the highest proportion into unemployment and education levels for adult are lower in Adur than for West Sussex as a whole. (ref Adur a community profile by the University of Brighton October 2002)

In conclusion the local infrastructure will be unable to cope with the increase in population from the three sites at "West Sompting" and "New Monks Farm".

#### Sompting/Worthing Gap

1. Dankton Lane north of the A27 acts as a corridor for wildlife.
2.  The field bounded by Dankton Lane and Malthouse Close acts as a funnel for wildlife allowing it access to the "Sompting Gap"
3. The character of the fields, bounded by West Street, A27, Church Lane and Dankton Lane, being pasture not arable means they support a greater range of prey animals.
4. If the development in the area bounded by Dankton Lane, A27 and Malthouse Close is developed the route for wildlife will be blocked by it and Sompting Abbots School thus giving no clear route to the gap without coming into contact with areas of human activity.

In conclusion the range of wildlife using the "West Sompting" North site will be seriously degraded. At present birds such as barn owls, kestrel, black kite, sparrow hawks, quall, pheasant, sea birds, garden and woodland birds use this area. I have also seen fox, deer, rabbit, field mice, bats and moles using the area.

#### Flooding

1.  At present the fields north of West Street act as a sponge soaking up excess water and releasing it slowly. However, even presently they can't

absorb all the water from heavy periods of rain and light flooding takes place.

2. The field "West Sompting" North which borders my property is 1 metre higher than my property and the clay substructure is only 0.4 metres below that.

In conclusion the risk of flooding in West Street especially in the areas between Church Lane and Street Barn, the Eastern end of West Street, Malthouse Close and Dankton Lane will increase.

#### Access

1. The access on to Dankton lane is very restricted, at its Southern end it is bounded on its Eastern edge by a flint wall which restricts visibility and is very narrow, there are many minor accidents there where people cut the corner because they can't see traffic approaching the junction. At the northern end the access is via the A27 into a very narrow road. Turning off here is extremely dangerous due to the speed of the traffic and which the WSCC highways have said will not be improved.
2. Dankton Lane is one of the accesses to West Street which people use when the A27 is backed up causing significant problems for residents.

#### Personal Concerns

1. The loss of access to the downs and northern Worthing via the footpath across the "West Sompting" North field.
2. Lack of privacy and security due to my boundary wall only being 1.2 meters high on the development side.
3. The coastal strip from Brighton to Bognor has sustained a significant amount of development over the years with significant loss of country side amenities and the further erosion of our green spaces and strategic gaps can only worsen our quality of life.

#### To summarise

I am against any development which encroaches on our few remaining strategic gaps and believe that these developments will have a detrimental effect on the lives of people living in the Lancing and Sompting area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 890  
Organisation Lancing College  
Agent's Organisation Stiles Harold Williams

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHED LETTER WITH MAPS.

'A Strategy for Change and Prosperity' and the strategic allocation at New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport in particular matters relating to the proposed junction arrangement in Options 1 and 2.

Please see attached letter dated 5th November 2013.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 905  
Organisation The British Horse Society  
Agent's Organisation

RD Policy 5 - para 2.57

Safe and improved access across the A27 is also essential for equestrians, who use the Downs Link, the Old Shoreham Toll Bridge and bridleway (BW) 2065 (north of Sussex Pad). The wording in the last sentence should reflect this.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 905  
Organisation The British Horse Society  
Agent's Organisation

Improved access across the A27 to the South Downs National Park is also needed for equestrians and wording should acknowledge this.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 885

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear sir/madam

I am writing to object to the proposed development of 600 houses etc. to the New Monks Farm Site.

I understand that there are a shortage of houses for people but I cannot believe that building them plus a school, community centre and a business development on a known flood plain is anything but stupidity. Last Christmas, and in to the New Year we had serious problems with the water levels which resulted in having lorries emptying road gullies day and night to prevent the area from being flooded. The chaps did a fantastic job and we are very grateful to them for all their hard work over the holiday period when I am sure they would have preferred to be at home with their families. When I went to work on Monday I noticed the roads around this area were starting to flood, and this was after just 1 day of heavy rain. Building extra houses etc. will only increase the possibility of serious flooding. We were very fortunate where our house is situated as we did not have any trouble over Christmas with the loss of gas and problems with sewage. How would you feel if you had to spend the Christmas period without gas and the use of your toilet.

I cannot believe that they have planned to build a roundabout on the A27 east of the Sussex Pad. This will cause more problems than there already are for residents trying to gain access on to the main road. A few years ago a previous planning development was rejected by the Highways Agency. This was for approximately 100 houses. Now you want to build 600 plus a business unit. The A27 cannot take anymore sustained traffic. I have lived in this area for about 20 years and the traffic situation has got steadily worse. With an increase of traffic which will be inevitable I am concerned that we could have a serious accident happen.

I have had hands on experience with dealing with floods and the after effects. When I lived in Wisbech we were evacuated from our house due to the risk of flooding. Luckily my parent's house escaped any damaged but I spent the next week helping people around the neighbourhood salvaging what they could and helping cleaning their houses. It was not nice. About 12 years ago I was in charge of refurbishing a number of houses in Lewes after the flood there. You cannot appreciate the problems flooding causes until you have seen the devastation it causes. It stays with you for life.

We live in an area that is known to flood and building on a known flood plain will only add concern to the residents of this area.

So please in the interest of all the residents in this are Adur District Council MUST have no option but to back the local rate payers and object to this plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 883

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This letter concerns proposed building behind our property off the A27 at Lancing.

We would like to Remind you and highlight the horrendous conditions that we suffered over the Christmas period in 2012, we had guests of 6 people at times staying with us for the Christmas many times unable to even use the toilet!! Which is disgraceful, the pumps in the street could not cope due to the weather conditions and we were unable to flush the toilet for 2 weeks!! Which is not only unhygienic it is incredibly inconvenient the ONLY time the toilet could be flushed was whilst the tanker was OUTSIDE the house siphoning the drains which lasted about 10 minutes until the tanker was full!! As you can imagine the entire street all rushed to flush their toilets!! We had copious amounts of water and sewage running through our garden which was potentially harmful for our dog therefore unable to be let out! There was flooding to the adjacent properties and our allotment at the end of our garden was ruined after months of hardwork and money put into it and trees this year have died in our garden. This was VERY distressing to see. We all feel that it is clear to see from last years demonstration that the drainage system for our area is completely insufficient, unreliable and incapable of coping with the existing properties!! The thought of building more houses in this area is simply ridiculous!! Drains overflowed, roads flooded, gardens flooded, properties flooded!! We DO NOT want another Christmas ruined last last year!!

It was very embarrassing, inconvenient and quite frankly unbelievable being unable to offer guests a toilet to use!!

We strongly protest at the absolute utmost at the proposed plans and do not want to be subjected to this level of treatment again and for it definitely not to be made worse by further developments.

We all pay our water bills and would at the least expect for the drainage system to be in working order!!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 882

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Airport

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Housing near Aerodromes is never a good idea. Aerodromes and the noise of aircraft will bring complaints to the Aerodrome and the local Council in the future.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 872

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to state my objection to the building of 600 homes on the flood plain at Monks Farm for the following reason:

The displacement of water which would inevitably follow would cause serious hardship for existing residents as well as those purchasing the new homes. Insurers are reluctant to cover house and contents if the area is at risk of flooding, if they do the excess applied and the cost would be formidable. Christmas 2012 and the devastating impact upon the lives of some residents is, I would argue, evidence for caution in building upon a flood plain, particularly given the unusually high levels of rainfall that we have experienced over the past year or so. There doesn't appear to be any predictive analysis on the environmental impact over the next 50 or 100 years, or even a coherent explanation as to how displacement water activity will be managed assuming, of course, that it can be.

Other concerns:

Of the 600 houses proposed, only 30% are allocated for social housing: this equates to 180 units when, according to a quote given by an officer at Tim Loughton's meeting last Thursday(7.11), there is a local waiting list of 1,000. If recent builds in Lancing are an indicator of the sort of prices being tagged by developers, the remaining units will not fall within the 'affordable housing' criteria.

The traffic flow on the A27 would be increased exponentially, creating further delays and making it even more difficult for residents of South and North Lancing to gain access to the A27. (I personally have waited up to 15 minutes during the rush hour); Replacing traffic lights with a round-about at the cross-roads intersecting at Lancing College/Coombes and Airport will increase the speed of traffic and will, again, make it difficult to access the A27, and place residents/workers at risk of accident.

As stated at Tim Loughton's meeting, an ideal place for building homes would be the old Cement Works; I understood from the meeting that this land belongs to Horsham Council but that there is policy stating that councils should help one another where it is within their remit. This land, which is within ADC has been empty for years and would be the perfect place for meeting central government directions.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear All,

I am passing this on as a matter of urgency, as requested in the email below.

The West Beach drainage problem is getting worse.

Please see the email below written by one of the residents who actually knows about drainage as a previous scientific officer on drainage for the Environment Agency.

I personally feel this needs attention by the authorities as it's getting worse. I urge the local authorities and agencies involved in drainage for the area to get involved and try and alleviate what is becoming a desperate problem for the residents of West Beach.

As the writer explains, the only thing which has recently changed to affect the drainage is the 50 acre football complex on New Monks Farm. What price a really prolonged period of rain which coincides with period of high tides. Period.

Once again, to the point of exhaustion – Adur must exclude the proposed flood plain developments from the strategic plan.

And once again, could the planning team log this as yet another objection to the proposed New Monks Farm & Aiport developments and confirm receipt of this email.

ATTACHED EMAIL:

Dear All

I have lived at the extreme west end of West Way for very nearly 17 years and the one thing that we were always thankful for was that we didn't get the water welling up through the concrete as it does further down the road. We have had standing water when a heavy or continuous rain event meant that the soakaways could not cope, but that has always gradually subsided within a few hours.

We went out about 1.30pm today and our end of West Way was dry as usual. Further down the road we drove through the worst flooding that I have ever seen with Bristol Avenue flooded right to the far end. The other side roads also have a great deal of water, apart from West Avenue which usually escapes.

When we returned just after 2.30pm we were shocked to see the water welling up between the concrete slabs in the circle. This has NEVER happened before and it shows a worrying change to the flood issues on West Beach Estate. Just in case someone wants to explain this away, I will put in 3 that I think will spring to mind and counter the first two with an irrefutable answer:

1) I am aware that we are in the midst of one of the highest high tides of this year, but these occur at some point every year and have never come up in the circle in the (nearly) 17 years I have lived here.

2) We need the soakaways to be rodded but they have not suddenly become significantly more blocked than they were a few weeks/months ago. We have had standing water before but only excess rain from above, not water welling up from under the ground.

3) The only thing that has happened recently that has never happened before is the interference with the surface of the flood plain by Brighton &

Hove Albion.

Once water has forced a route through somewhere it will always find its way there again. This was proved by the floods in Chichester in 1994 when the water that did not run through the city followed its ancient course east of Chichester south to the sea. So, we are now in a position that flood water could be a feature of the west end of West Way where it has never been seen before. If you download photo 3 above in particular, you can see the ripples from the water rising from below the concrete. Photo 4 above shows the extent of the water across whole circle.

Southern Water is due here tomorrow to start the permanent repair of the road where the sewer burst last July. They have also to repair our side of the circle (see photo below and photos 1 & 2 above) because their machines damaged that when they were mending the sewer. We are concerned that they will not be able to start the work because of the water that is still coming up through the concrete.

I will welcome any responses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 915

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing about our concerns of proposed building on the flood plain opposite my house. If buildings were to be built there where would the water that sits there every winter go to. Most probably into the houses along Old Shoreham road that suffer a lot already. I knew a family who lived in one of those houses and they had to use the toilets at the leisure centre because they couldn't use theirs due to sewage coming up and having a pump going all day and all night for days to clear it. Please think again

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 879

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With regards to housing developments planned for green gaps at Monks Farm and Sompting I would like to object to these proposals given due consideration to the following points:

### 1) Flooding

Already a significant issue in the area, the development of land that is already at high risk of flooding seems to be a severely flawed plan. Being resident in the area, I have seen works being carried out to try to solve the flooding problem so it is clear that it is already a known issue. While those already in the flood risk areas have (and have had) to deal with these issues it seems incomprehensible that future residents of the proposed site would purchase a property that would more than likely flood leaving them in a property they are unable to insure or sell in future.

### 2) Traffic and congestion

Again, already a very busy area around the Lancing Manor roundabout where it joins the A27, through Sompting all the way through to Lyons farm at Worthing and beyond, the substantial increase in traffic that would result from these developments would severely affect residents already living in the area such as us. It is already a noticeable problem and the addition of two developed sites would just put a strain on roads, which are already overcrowded in this area.

### 3) Over-subscription of schools

With two sites already developed along West Lane in Lancing, there is already an oversubscription to local schools. Having two more developed sites would impact on admissions at these schools even further, potentially forcing local residents (i.e. us and other families with young children) to have to send their children to schools further afield due to a callous overdevelopment of the area.

In overall terms, the combination of these points raised above shows a definitive reason as to why the developments should not go ahead in anywhere near the volume they are planned. It would be a strain on an already troubled flood risk area, inflame traffic and congestion in and around the local area for residents and would be an unnecessary development on valuable green space.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 878

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find my comments below:-

My particular objections to the latest plan for Lancing and Sompting are:-

1. The sheer scale: The number of new houses proposed are grossly disproportionate to the size and character of the existing area.
2. Room for expansion in the areas proposed is particularly restricted; by the coastline to the south, the close proximity of the South Downs to the north, and the airfield to the east.
3. The field to the west of Dankton Lane forms a large part of the "green corridor" between the Downs and the coast. This is an invaluable habitat and access route for wildlife, and provides separation between Lancing and Sompting, maintaining the rural character of Sompting village.
4. Local schools don't presently have the spare capacity for the extra numbers of pupils that this huge number of new houses will provide.
5. Last but not least, the east – west road system is already beyond any reasonable limit of its capacity. The west-going traffic on the A27 tails back from Hill Barn traffic lights all the way to the Shoreham flyover between about 5.00 to 7.00 pm on weekdays, and eastbound traffic is crawling all the way through Worthing. The extra traffic generated by this proposed plan and any extra junctions or roundabouts will both severely exacerbate traffic congestion.

The A259 coast road and West Street through Sompting are the only other (badly restricted) alternatives and are similarly clogged at peak times.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority recognises the severely constrained nature of the plan area of the Adur Local Plan and that difficult decisions are required to be made by the district council through the Local Plan as to where major development should be located. In allocating this sensitive site as a strategic allocation SDNPA welcome the references in Policy 5:

- (i) to improved access across the A27 to the South Downs National Park for pedestrians and cyclists having to be provided as part of the development
- (ii) to the landscape strategy / green infrastructure strategy for the site
- (iii) that development must respect the landscape of the Lancing – Shoreham-by-Sea Green Gap and the South Downs National Park.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 913

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Sirs

Whilst in principle we agree that Adur will require some regeneration and new homes for the future We feel we must register some concerns for our immediate area and some that affect us directly

#### # Known Flood Area

Having suffered from both front and rear gardens being under water many times we are concerned that large square metres of ground at the Monks Farm site will be infilled with concrete resulting in lots more surface water being displaced to the surrounding area which is already fragile with high water tables.

We are not confident that any sewer and drainage installed will cope with periods of prolonged wet weather.

How can they test the sustainability of these proposed drainage systems.?

The ditches at the rear of our property have recently been cleared to a depth of half a metre and although we are very grateful for this a heavy fall of rain last week raised the water level 4 inches overnight and flowed over the depth of the new ditch causing the bank below our garden being waterlogged.

#### # Infrastructure

We live on the A27 on the South Side between the Tempest Garage and the Sports Centre Roundabout and witness the traffic levels on a daily basis.

We currently rely on the traffic lights at the airport to provide a gap in busy traffic to enable us to enter and exit our property- sometimes having to wait for 3 changes as gaps sometimes don't happen dependent on speed of traffic.

( We are one of 2 bungalows with longer front garden and no slip road so have to exit directly on to the A27)

In all honesty any new commercial or residential buildings which would automatically increase levels of traffic should not be considered at all until a bypass is constructed as current levels of traffic often cannot be accommodated - we are a known bottleneck at busy times with frequent accidents being reported which cause gridlock.

The Revised Adur Plan page 163 states that the Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken needs to demonstrate that all new buildings must remain safe for their lifetime and that those sites will not increase flood risk elsewhere!!!!

We are in a small area betwixt downs and sea with highly developed areas already built with the remainder land being vulnerable to flooding.

Please reconsider your plan and reduce housing and commercial levels and make it known to the Government that it is improper to impose building on such a level of development that is not viable in a fragile environment nor comparable with other counties with more open space and better road infrastructure.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 594

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 769

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am completely opposed to policies 5, 7 and Map 7 in the Adur Strategic Plan.

Despite what the Environment Agency say, flood risk cannot be mitigated for the New Monks Farm proposed development. How can they even think to say this after last Christmas's 8 weeks of sheer hell to this area in North Lancing? This agency was involved in dealing with this extreme crisis together with all the other agencies and local authorities so they should know precisely the terrible problems we had.

This is a grade 3 flood risk area and must never be built on further for either the wellbeing of existing residents who know what it is to be affected by severe drainage and sewage issues, let alone any proposed new builds who will be lucky to even get insurance or obtain a mortgage. The impact will be not just dwellings west of the proposed New Monks Farm development but all the community in Lancing who live around this very sensitive flood plain.

Adur District Council has no option but to exclude the New Monks Farm and airport developments from the plan. I, as a rate paying resident demand it, all my neighbours in the community demand it. They must never allow a repeat of another event like residents suffered at the start of 2013.

I live just off the A27. How can these highly skilled, highly paid professionals at the Highways Agency even attempt to agree with what's being planned?!

7 years ago they objected to a 100 homes development behind where I live because of the traffic effect on the A27. Where is the consistency? They are now happy to approve the significant additional traffic volume 600 homes, a school and business developments - on exactly the same site?! To make matters worse, they are also prepared to agree to yet another roundabout on this road which is already running at over capacity - hence the many traffic delays.

I personally have no faith in this agency, particularly after the so called drainage improvement works for 3 months running up to last Christmas. The outcome as we all know was the worst flooding ever experienced along the Lancing stretch of the A27 because they totally failed to prove the drainage outfalls in the start up plan.

If you want to add to the degeneration of Lancing, then go ahead - this is just the right way to ensure businesses and people avoid coming here because of the severe traffic situation it will cause.

This development on the A27 must never be allowed - it is illogical, it will cause gridlock, it will cause an increase in accidents and it certainly will not promote the regeneration of this area.

Adur District Council must exclude any further development on the Lancing-Shoreham Gap, preserve our green spaces for the community and for that matter, the country and the interests of our wellbeing, vigorously defend their action to the government inspectorate.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 267

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having experienced severe drainage problems from Summer 2012 through to the early part of 2013 I am strongly objecting to the development proposals in the Adur Draft Plan for the New Monks Farm and Airport areas (Policies 5 & 7).

Building up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5) with a school, community centre, 10,000 sq metres of business development plus all the road infrastructure will create an absolutely unacceptable flood risk for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

The same applies to the 15,000 sq metres of proposed business development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

Here in North Lancing, we experienced 8 weeks of devastation last Christmas with serious flooding, loss of sewerage and gas and know instinctively that the agencies and developers simply cannot mitigate this flood risk in such a shallow fall flood plain - 4 feet fall across 2 miles to the Shoreham sluices. It's a planning policy built on lunacy.

The draft plan has absolutely neglected to take account of this Christmas flooding event which has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds of the ratepayers' money to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation will be impossible in periods of sustained wet weather, How much more proof is required?

If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area, whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters.

Even though on the south side, for 'technical reasons', Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan, any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park. All areas in Lancing are interconnected by one thing - a flood plain. The same 'technical reasons' must apply to New Monks Farm and the airport. I have absolutely no confidence in the experts' or developers' judgement that flood risk in this area can be mitigated for.

Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas and into the New Year and defend their action to Government to exclude this flood plain development from the plan.

Also, it is also completely unacceptable to contemplate a roundabout (Map7) on this stretch of the A27. The road is at over capacity now.

Seven years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected by the Highways Agency, This was the main reason a hearing upheld the decision to not approve the application.

If the A27 then was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes, how can it approve the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed. Together with the proposed roundabout, this is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council, its councillors and officers have no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its rate paying community.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 876

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the suggestion of development within Sompting/Lancing especially the comment in the plan of 'It will also be necessary to release the following greenfield sites on the edge of the built up areas to ensure an adequate supply of suitable land for development'. It's terrible that green belt land is going to be used. Sompting/Lancing is a peaceful village town which is surrounded by countryside. We should be preserving this village feel and protecting the beautiful land rather than destroying it with new housing developments. It will ruin the area and cause more problems for the area. Adding more housing developments will put more pressure on the roads, schools, doctors surgeries, jobs and other services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 933

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.  
My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 880

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With regards to housing developments planned for green gaps at Monks Farm and Sompting I would like to object to these proposals given due consideration to the following points:

### 1) Flooding

Already a significant issue in the area, the development of land that is already at high risk of flooding seems to be a severely flawed plan. Being resident in the area, I have seen works being carried out to try to solve the flooding problem so it is clear that it is already a known issue. While those already in the flood risk areas have (and have had) to deal with these issues it seems incomprehensible that future residents of the proposed site would purchase a property that would more than likely flood leaving them in a property they are unable to insure or sell in future.

### 2) Traffic and congestion

Again, already a very busy area around the Lancing Manor roundabout where it joins the A27, through Sompting all the way through to Lyons Farm at Worthing and beyond, the substantial increase in traffic that would result from these developments would severely affect residents already living in the area such as us. It is already a noticeable problem and the addition of two developed sites would just put a strain on roads, which are already overcrowded in this area.

### 3) Over-subscription of schools

With two sites already developed along West Lane in Lancing, there is already an oversubscription to local schools. Having two more developed sites would impact on admissions at these schools even further, potentially forcing local residents (i.e. us and other families with young children) to have to send their children to schools further afield due to a callous overdevelopment of the area.

In overall terms, the combination of these points raised above shows a definitive reason as to why the developments should not go ahead in anywhere near the volume they are planned. It would be a strain on an already troubled flood risk area, inflame traffic and congestion in and around the local area for residents and would be an unnecessary development on valuable green space.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 965

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Everything we have learned about the Adur Plan is pure madness. The points below are just some of the issues which building on the Lancing Shoreham Gap will cause, let alone unbelievably an additional roundabout which is being proposed for the A27.

1. Flood Plain, what part do they not understand. Remember Last Christmas?
2. Sea levels are meant to be getting higher.
3. Water, not long ago we were going to have Drought?
4. Electricity, talking about not enough back up.
5. Who is going to live there, are we going to create villages to bite us back in years to come (& pay for them to be there).
6. A27 comes to grinding halt due to so much added local traffic and the pollution that goes with it.
7. The Airport has been there for years, all the people in the 600 homes will complain about the noise and want it closed down (then build some more houses)!
8. Have insurance companies been invited to see if they would actually insure these properties (especially if they might be under water).
9. And what about the wild life? Already a large area has been lost to the football club development.
10. And flash floods? Heavy rain is more frequency. Will the area be able to cope, when it's not coping now?

As our elected members, Adur District councillors must delete the New Monks Farm and Airport and A27 developments from the plan for the wellbeing of the local community. Not to do so will create degeneration for the residents of Lancing not regeneration!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 779

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sirs,

We wish to raise the following objections to the revised draft Adur local plan 2013.

1. There is severe traffic congestion every day on the A27 from Shoreham flyover through to Worthing and also in the opposite direction from Worthing. Nothing has been done to alleviate the existing traffic problems, and putting in another roundabout for the proposed new development of 600+ home, school and business premises will only exacerbate the existing problems.
  2. The whole area is subject to frequent flooding already, last winter North Lancing was flooded for a period of 8 weeks, not only from rain and ground water but also with sewerage. Building new homes on an existing flood plain to my mind is bordering on the criminal. Who will take responsibility for this when these homes are flooded? These new home owners will not be able to insure their homes, nor sell them.
  3. Sewerage. There are existing sewerage problems now around this area for local residents, without adding 600+ homes, a new school and new business premises.
  4. The new development situated at Monks Farm will be a hazard for the existing functionality of the airport.
  5. Why on earth are you considering building new business premises at Monks Farm, when there are plenty of vacant local premises to be had. There is an existing highways infrastructure problem here, and this would be seriously detrimental to any new business wanting to operate from this area.
  6. This development would mean the loss of another open space for wildlife, birds and butterflies, which will also have a serious effect on peoples' wellbeing.
  7. Our local Police service, hospital and GP services are already overstretched in this area, where are these extra facilities that will be needed going to come from?
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 955

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.53- A27 just can't take anymore traffic. This week as so often there was an accident on it, all the traffic drove though the Airport and caused chaos on the A259 leading to the Shoreham roundabout on a already busy Sat AM congested main road.

2.54- Golf Course! Who are we kidding? It's another housing estate in waiting.

2.58- do you intend on having traffic police on site to make sure the home owners don't use there cars? Get real, what would you do?

2.61- quote from Telegraph this year, Homeowners in Redcar criticised a water storage system, completed last year, after 60 homes were flooded. Alistair Baker from Northumbrian Water said the "ferocity" of some storms was "well in excess of the design capabilities" of defence schemes.

NMF & Hasler WILL FLOOD...if all this building on our Flood Plain goes ahead.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 957

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

600 homes and 25,000sq m of business development in the Lancing Shoreham flood plain??!! A roundabout on the A27??!!

Just what planet is this authority living on? Angry? I am more than angry at the total negligence being exercised by this council not to ensure the continued well being of its residents, something which is clearly stipulated in the National Planning Policy Framework. According to this policy the community should in fact be enjoying improving benefit from such initiatives within the area not the absolute reverse.

How many of the officers and councillors experienced what the residents here in North Lancing experienced last Christmas into the New Year?

None, I would suggest!

Otherwise they would not even dare to put to the public such an outrageous proposal which even an idiot can see will end in disaster for not only the current community but any family or person who invests in these proposed new builds – if they are lucky enough to get flood cover or a mortgage.

For mobility I have to always use a wheel chair. When the event struck last Christmas, we could not even use our toilet facilities. One flush and it overflowed into our homes. My being incapacitated, this was an absolute nightmare for a long period until some respite came in small bursts to allow the toilet to be flushed when the tide was out at Shoreham!.

Apart from that my back garden was awash with water for weeks into February and totally unusable. We had tankers pumping for weeks in our local roads, four at a time in our small close. Sleeping at nights became virtually impossible.

It was absolutely hell!!!

And this council is prepared to let this occur frequently by filling the flood plain with concrete because the Environment Agency says flood risk can be mitigated for. What world are they living in? Did this agency do a study after the recent flooding? I know they didn't – their data is based upon readings taken in a dry spell in 2012 – absolutely irrelevant to what followed.

The Highways Agency are no better. They reject an application at the end of Manor Close some 7 years ago – the same site as the planned development because of resulting traffic flows being unacceptable to the operation of the A27 – and now they are happy for the enormous increase in traffic volumes from the flood plain developments and with a roundabout to boot!

Apart from the total inability of this over capacity road to cope – it will make it highly dangerous and virtually impossible for local residents including myself to access this trunk road because of continuous flowing traffic because of the roundabout.

To conclude, as a long term resident in Lancing, I insist, as do my fellow neighbours, – more relevantly – demand that the planned development policies 5 & 7 are take out of the Adur Plan and the experiences of the community in Lancing be used to demonstrate to the government inspectors that this flood plain area is unsustainable and puts the total well being of our Lancing community at risk.

As elected members to represent us, the district councillors must take notice of the rate paying public that voted for them and make the right decision.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 774

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I think it is vital that the flood plain should be maintained for the whole of that area to contemplate building on that amount of land is too much of a risk to the A27 and the surrounding area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 959

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am objecting to the whole plan for Sompting and Lancing as I cannot see how the A259 and A27 could cope with an extra 2000 cars using these roads every day. Until the transport problem has been addressed there should be no major building developments in Adur.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 4

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I would like to express my objection to the proposal of houses being built on the Lancing flood plain.

Regardless of the governments demand for houses to be built, it would be madness to build on a flood plain. Where does the council think the water will go if they lay concrete on this land? Having gone through the nightmare of last Christmas flooding, (my neighbour had water rising through his kitchen floor boards, and manholes were overflowing), this will only exasperate the situation. There is also the traffic to consider, the A27 is running at maximum load now, and to increase the amount of traffic will only lead to larger traffic jams and an unbearable situation. Try travelling through Worthing on the A27 at peak times and you know what I mean.

It's very easy to make decisions about building in an area you don't live in.

Please put this letter with the hopefully large collection of objections and see that the council see it.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 767

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: MONKS FARM HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

Yesterday evening my husband and I attended a meeting at Lancing Parish Hall for a discussion concerning the above mentioned.

Of course it goes without saying that there was not one resident either of Sompting or Lancing who was in agreement with the developments both here and in Sompting. Nobody on this earth could agree that it is feasible to building 400-650 houses on a flood plain!!! End of story really.

Last Christmas, due to a deluge of rain, the pump out lorries were here on and off for several weeks. Residents could not flush their toilets, some people were without gas on Christmas Day and there was raw sewage in the gardens. We live opposite Southern Water's holding facility and lorries were going in and out all through the night.

The other huge factors impacting on the local community is of course the lack of infrastructure to accommodate this massive housing project and the volume of traffic which inevitably would arrive with it.

It is not only the cars from the new residences to contend with, but also the increased traffic visiting the Brighton and Hove Albion training ground.

The A27 is already a nightmare as I described when I wrote a letter to the Lancing Herald a couple of weeks ago. It referred to a car that had broken down near the Lancing Manor roundabout which in turn caused a young lady to career off the road into a post due to the traffic not slowing down. My husband and I were walking past when it happened and were lucky not to have been wiped out! It may be cliché but the whole scenario is a disaster waiting to happen.

As a flyover or bypass has obviously in the past been out of the question, due to cost no doubt, the only alternative would be to widen the A27 to make three lanes and put traffic lights at the junctions to the roundabout. Even then it would not solve the rush hour problems along this stretch of the A27. The road is totally inadequate to cope with this volume of traffic.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 766

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I was in attendance at the meeting in Lancing Parish Hall regarding the proposed New Monks Farm development. It was an interesting meeting, and I feel there is little doubt that there is a great strength of feeling against this plan, which many including myself obviously consider to be complete madness, given the environmental implications.

I am using this communication to formally OBJECT to the proposed development, on environmental grounds, setting out some of my reasoning below.

I recently downloaded a document from the Adur website, entitled 'Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013', which I am assuming is a current document as it is dated September 2013. The map on page 20 prepared with data from the Environment Agency (May 2013) shows the site of the proposed New Monks Farm development sitting squarely in an area marked 'High Probability of Flooding' (Zone 3).

Having listened to various speakers on this subject the other night, I am more convinced than before of the potential for severe damage to surrounding homes and disruption to residents' lives as a result of building on the flood plain here. Residents of Mash Barn Lane, Manor Road, and Wide Way areas amongst others recounted their experiences of what has already happened when the water table is saturated, both flood water and foul water backing up into various homes with serious implications for health (and future insurability of properties in these locations). These events were also prior to the construction of the football pitches currently taking place just to the South of this area. One of the councillors pointed out that the playing field development will include underground tanks in order to capture rainwater for recycling on to the pitches. Fair enough, but what happens when those tanks are full, and the stored water is not needed for this purpose? Probably for about nine months of the year. That is just more square footage being taken out of the flood plain area.

Another related subject introduced into the debate was the traffic situation on the A27. Traffic on this road is already very heavy at certain times of the day (not always just at peak times). This is not an aspect that I feel expert enough to comment upon, even though I and my family/friends are already affected daily by congestion in this area. Suffice to say that a proposed addition of another roundabout won't do anything to alleviate the extra traffic flow. The Lancing roundabout self-evidently doesn't work in this respect, creating queues in at least three directions; adding a second one within a few hundred metres will just compound the problem.

I understand that the local authority is tasked with coming up with a plan to fulfil demands made by central planning to show areas that can be developed. However, this particular area should be left alone as it is part of the flood plain. Given what I believe is the glaring unsuitability of the site, and the possibility that any plan put forward by Adur risks rejection/overruling by a central planning body, does this body not also have to take into account the environmental issues? Given the recent occurrences at Tewkesbury, for example, it must be folly to consider that this plan has any merit. Or have development guidelines now been revised to include building on flood plains?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 843

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

(3) Now with regard to the other development at New Monks farm

- The plan has not addressed the major A27 issues to the west at Lyons Farm junction and beyond
- And no detailed proposals are put forward for the nearby North Lancing roundabout which can no longer cope adequately during demand peaks. Only mitigation measures are mentioned for the roundabout. The east, south and west junction cannot be widened so you're left with traffic light management which will cause blight to the local residents with longer queues forming down Grinstead Lane. The westbound junction compounded by more cars coming from New Monk's development.
- The proposal to have a another new roundabout to access New Monk's Farm from the A27 would create even more start stop traffic through this stretch of the A27 to the detriment of A27 traffic flow and to the residents along the A27.. As Grinstead Lane is out of question then a feeder road parallel to the A27 is the best option with improvements at Sussex Pad junction. However I object to this development going ahead until a Bypass is designed and built that excludes the section of A27 from the Sussex Pad to the West of Durrington.
- Finally this development as proposed will only allow vehicular access from the A27. So that will be the only way in and out for residents apart from bus pedestrian and cycle accesses onto Mash Barn estate. This will not be good for Lancing supermarkets and local shops. Residents will go elsewhere to shop and smaller purchase that may have been found in Lancing will be picked up where the residents choose shop, e.g. Holmbush and Lyons Farm. So no great economic benefits for Lancing town centre?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 762

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am not able to quote any of the above, but object to anymore building in this already over populated area. All of the utilities struggle to cope with demand at times, and NHS and social services are stretched to full capacity. Schools and maternity services will also have difficulty coping if these plans go ahead.

This is not a case of NIMBY, but there is a tremendous amount of space north of the Downs.

There is also the little matter that if the fields are all taken, where are the owners of livestock -cows etc - supposed to keep and feed their animals? When Berriedale Drive was built in the early 1930s there was no shortage of land and numbers 49-51, and also 47, have enormous back gardens. Would it be worth considering this small green field site, or go to the north of the Downs and leave us alone?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 782

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sirs,

We wish to raise the following objections to the revised draft Adur local plan 2013.

1. There is severe traffic congestion every day on the A27 from Shoreham flyover through to Worthing and also in the opposite direction from Worthing. Nothing has been done to alleviate the existing traffic problems, and putting in another roundabout for the proposed new development of 600+ home, school and business premises will only exacerbate the existing problems.
  2. The whole area is subject to frequent flooding already, last winter North Lancing was flooded for a period of 8 weeks, not only from rain and ground water but also with sewerage. Building new homes on an existing flood plain to my mind is bordering on the criminal. Who will take responsibility for this when these homes are flooded? These new home owners will not be able to insure their homes, nor sell them.
  3. Sewerage. There are existing sewerage problems now around this area for local residents, without adding 600+ homes, a new school and new business premises.
  4. The new development situated at Monks Farm will be a hazard for the existing functionality of the airport.
  5. Why on earth are you considering building new business premises at Monks Farm, when there are plenty of vacant local premises to be had. There is an existing highways infrastructure problem here, and this would be seriously detrimental to any new business wanting to operate from this area.
  6. This development would mean the loss of another open space for wildlife, birds and butterflies, which will also have a serious effect on peoples' wellbeing.
  7. Our local Police service, hospital and GP services are already overstretched in this area, where are these extra facilities that will be needed going to come from?
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 756

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

These areas are all part of a flood plain. Further building will cause major flooding.  
Let's think about the infrastructure now!  
No more building.

Think about the birds, animals, views and walks. Look elsewhere for further housing.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 748

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Building on proposed sites would be a mistake because you already know this area is a flood plain.

Already the traffic backs up severely on the A259 and A27 at rush hour (which extends beyond an hour). The risk of flooding would be increased and West Beach Estate would bear the brunt of the problem. The BHA training site is already having problems with high water. The drains, which are holding a lot of water, would probably flood or block with rubbish and building materials from developers and residents of new homes, causing an increased likelihood of our area flooding. Will the council take responsibility for our damages when this happens? Why not build less houses in smaller areas, rather than large estates likely to cause problems further down the line?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 747

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No more building on our flood plain, the flood plain protects our homes flooding. Any more building and we will flood. I will hold WSCC & Adur District Council for any negligence as a direct or indirect result in excess building on the flood plain that results in flooding into my property.

Which part of the words 'flood plain' do the WSCC & Adur District Council not understand the full meaning of? Where on Earth do you think the excess flood water will end up?

The Plan is totally irresponsible in its entirety & should not have even been suggested in the first place. Total disregard for our environment.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 968

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Conservative Party

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

You will be aware that, together with local conservative district and parish councillors, I have organised two well attended public meetings at Sompting Village School on October 26th and at Lancing Parish Hall on October 31st. More than 320 people turned up at those meetings and not a single one expressed any support for the plans in their current form. I am attaching my account of these meetings from my website and please take these as a summary of the main concerns raised, which I share.

We have also circulated our own surveys to gauge concerns from a wider group of residents across Lancing and Sompting. These responses are still coming in and we will collage the findings and submit them as part of the formal consultation before the end of the two week extension period which Adur Council has helpfully granted. All those responses should therefore be treated as additional responses to be considered.

To summarise my objections:

- New Monks Farm is a well established flood plain. It contains a complicated series of drainage ditches which flow north west - south-east towards the River Adur and sluice gates at Adur Rec with a very shallow rise which makes it very vulnerable to blockage. Whilst it may be possible to alleviate flood hazard on new homes it can only be done at the expense of existing homes already very susceptible to flooding. The damage we saw last Christmas affecting the area around Manor Close and Grinstead Lane was the worst for very many years and that is before any new buildings have been added. It is essential that this flood plain is preserved for the protection of dwellings on the Mash Barn Estate and surrounds, West Beach to the south and indeed to the continued working of the Airport. In addition there are already considerable problems with sewerage capacity. Whilst some limited fringe development may be feasible around the edges, development on anything like the scale being proposed is completely unsustainable and unviable.

- Traffic congestion is already a nightmare on the A27. Simply adding a new roundabout is not guaranteed to help alleviate the existing problem let alone the additional traffic resulting from a further 600 homes being added to the area. Added to this will be further traffic caused by the proposed new school and business development.

- At West Sompting, the number of houses represents a very substantial ingress which can only change the character of this village. Again some limited fringe development is possible but the amount proposed is not sustainable. There is a flooding consideration where previously the area around West Street has been very prone to surface water flooding. The traffic situation in and around West Street is already chaotic despite significant investment in traffic calming measures with limited effect. With very limited access points into the new development where again most residents will need to rely on private vehicles, the details around traffic calming and ameliorative measures are recklessly vague. Whilst there is likely to be some 'pay back' with enhanced facilities in return for the new development, it is clear that the balance is still completely out of proportion.

- Overall there are serious question marks about the robustness of the demographic data and population growth forecasts being used. It is unclear where the demand will come from, above and beyond, the level of social rented housing which is already required to cater with existing local waiting lists. Adur needs to make a very forceful case to the Planning Inspectorate that we have serious grounds to be considered a special case for not being able to take the level of additional housing being asked of us. Few other regions are restricted by a coastline to the south and a national park

to the north, where 53% of the district's area space is covered by national park designated land. The remaining target area is therefore already a very densely populated urban coastal strip with very few spaces left for significant development on this scale. We are not an inner city district with a continuous urban character, we are a coastal district in a rural county and as such we do not have the infrastructure to cope with an even more densely populated area.

I hope that all these factors will be robustly deployed by Adur Council when formulating its final submission to the Planning Inspectorate. To do so otherwise would be to sanction a crazy level of irresponsible and unsustainable over-development which will impact hugely on the quality of life for the many thousands of residents who have chosen to live in Adur for very many years.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 746  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

It's not so good that you plan to build on New Monks Farm land.

This is still a flood plain. I am very worried about this. As a bed fast disabled man, what would I do if my home floods? It is bad enough now.

Please do not use this land to build.

---

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 744  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

My wife and I strongly object to new homes being built on New Monks Farm, Lancing and Sompting strategic green gaps. There was so much serious flooding in Lancing last winter and it will put homes at even higher risk. Also, our roads are so congested already and the A27 will not cope with another two housing estates spilling into it. The proposed exits from both sides would cause a nightmare scenario. Please keep Sompting and Lancing as they are.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Strategic Allocation – New Monks Farm

The Sussex Wildlife Trust sees this allocation as further erosion to the green gap between Shoreham and Lancing. We are particularly concerned in light of the biodiversity and flood risk issues in this area. We are unclear how development of this green gap will seek to secure the gain in natural capital which is vital for sustainable growth in West Sussex.

Of the suggested uses for this site, the Sussex Wildlife Trust is concerned that section 2.53 only specifies that the level of residential development will be dependent on landscape and biodiversity issues. Given the other types of suggested development for this area, we urge Adur DC to ensure all types of development at any sites is dependent on landscape and biodiversity issues. This paragraph also highlights that development at this site would unlock further development at Shoreham Airport, we strongly suggest that each site needs to be considered on its individual suitability and should not be considered purely as a precursor for further development in adjacent areas. When considering these sites it will be important to consider the cumulative impacts of development on the wider network of water bodies between Lancing and Shoreham Airport.

Section 2.55 of the plan identifies the site as having low landscape sensitivity. The Sussex Wildlife Trust would seek clarification on this phrasing. We would like to know how this site contributes as part of the green infrastructure strategy for the district and its adjoining LPAs. We feel it is extremely short sighted for the district to be allocating sites prior to the production of green infrastructure strategies. We would also like to see section 2.56 go further than to say that the riparian habitats should be retained and managed. Inline with the NPPF, the LPA should actively seek to enhance and connect these habitats to improve the ecological connectivity. NPPF sections 109, 114.

#### Revised Draft Policy 5: New Monks Farm Lancing

While we do not support further encroachment into this sensitive area, we feel that if this proposed policy goes forward it needs to be more robust in terms of the biodiversity gains that developers will be expected to deliver. The policy suggests only ecological enhancements for the North West corner of the site. This is insufficient, in accordance with the NPPF enhancements should be sought through all aspects of any suggested development.

We suggest that the reference to an ecological management plan for the site, addresses long term maintenance for new and existing habitats. The policy needs to clearly state that this will be financially supported by the developer and not constitute a management plan with no resources or financial backing.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 742

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This area is already suffering from traffic congestion along both the A27 and A259, any additional traffic is not needed. I cannot see how an introduction of roundabouts and improved junctions would help. A bypass is needed, but unlikely to happen. Also, how can consideration be given to building on a flood plain. There are already problems as it is - 650 houses and a school will not help.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 741

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The West Beach Estate are living on a flood plain and cannot sustain any more building locally. If this does happen we will flood! We suffer enough already with surface water flooding our roads and having to paddle through ankle deep water to get to our homes. The flood plain protects our homes.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 764

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: NEW MONKS FARM.

We do not need anymore buildings on our flood plain - today (4th November) was an example of why we are worried about our homes. The water came right up George V Avenue and was across our roads and pavements all the way to the cost road. I have to walk to the bus stop in the morning and evenings and I found it difficult today. If it gets any higher we will need to invest in a dingy to get out! The residents of West Beach do not want to be flood anymore than what we have to put up with already. If the flood plain is built upon then we will have major problems with our homes and who is going to pay for all of the repairs?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 824

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Our Concerns on the Adur Draft Plan - Policies 5&7

Dear Sirs,

Having found a house to our liking, we moved from Surrey to North Lancing 20 years ago to this address which was most tranquil and ideally located between the coast and the wonderful South Downs. In the middle nineties, during the month of January, each year we started to notice the presence of surface water in the corner of our front garden - at that time to a depth of 1/2". Neighbours informed us that it was water from the many springs in the area. Then to our horror we had 4" in both the front and back gardens. Assistance was needed from the water company who, using a large pump situated on my neighbour's forecourt, pumped the flood water into a drainage culvert which outfalls into a drainage ditch behind both our houses. This ran both day and night, and we can assure you was far from noiseless. Manor Close, a neighbouring road experienced the identical problem.

Furthermore, it is now well documented by West Sussex CC and Adur DC that from the 21st December 2012 there were severe drainage problems which affected the whole of the Lancing Manor area south of the A27. Our toilets were out of use most of the time. We had large tankers, often 4 at a time in our road, pumping out water, 24 hours a day for almost a further 8 weeks. Our sleep was affected with the noise. Our front and back gardens were under 6" of water for days, our the garden was flooded and sandbagged for most of that time and unusable. Our front door was sandbagged for weeks... The inconvenience to our daily lives was immeasurable and quite frankly in a modern society, totally unacceptable. And the ratepayers had to fund the many hundreds of thousands of pounds for the emergency and remedial works involved. So, you can imagine how we (and our neighbours) all felt when we read that a substantial number of buildings are being planned for the area- a proposal which appears to be residing in the realms of insanity - for development in this flood plain! The volume of development proposed on New Monks Farm and the Airport is absolute madness! The Lancing Shoreham gap is a very slow flowing flood plain- Filling it with concrete is simply not an option! The Lancing Shoreham Gap must be left as a natural, functioning flood plain with no inhibition of drainage flows because of profit motivated building development.

Adur must delete these elements from the draft plan - not to do so will mean that the recent Christmas event will become a frequent occurrence. Residents will have problems obtaining insurance cover, both existing and for the new builds. The community's quality of life will deteriorate because of the stupidity of the council members who were elected to look after our wellbeing. Next May's local elections will certainly see some radical changes we are certain if these elements in the plan prevail. In respect of the two roundabout options on the A27 - words can only fail! And the Highways Agency will be happy for one of them to be created! Already there is an increase in the number of 44+ tonne lorries moving both ways between Southampton and Dover with the latter port's new harbour scheme.. The manoeuvring of these large vehicles at times is terrifying on local roads which were originally designed for pony & trap users.

If the developments did go ahead, with the housing, business development areas, community centre and a school, the additional volume of traffic using this already over capacity trunk road defies belief. It must amount to the addition of many thousands of vehicle movements daily on and off the A27. At present it can take as long as 5 minutes to exit Grinstead Lane at Manor Roundabout to travel east along the Mill to return home, waiting for a break in the west flowing traffic flow. We dread to think how much longer this will take with constant flowing traffic from one of the proposed new roundabouts with no break at the Sussex Pad lights to the east!

I hope that the council members understand that the flooding in December/January this year, and we are both in our 80s, we live in complete trepidation that any sustained periods of wet weather will only increase the problems occurring from the inhibited flow of surface and ground water if the flood plain development proposals are permitted to go ahead. If our council has a conscience, as representatives of this community, we, as rate

paying residents demand that these flood plain developments be completely deleted from the plan in the interests of our personal wellbeing and that of the whole community.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 934

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 935

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My concerns lie with the future layout of the A27, in my case for cycling to work. My comments are not so much regarding the provision of a cycle path along the A27. but the ability to negotiate crossing the A27.

I currently enter the A27 from the North Lancing road at the Manor roundabout & cycle east towards Shoreham, turning left at Coombes Road towards Steyning. On my way home from work, I need to cross the road at the Sussex Pad traffic lights, this would be virtually impossible for me if the lights were taken away, or a roundabout put in place at this junction, without a pedestrian crossing. It would also prevent Shoreham walkers & cyclists from accessing the South Downs National Park, & likewise prevent walkers & cyclists from the National Park from accessing Shoreham.

Further, to get home from work I either have to negotiate a right turning back to North Lancing at the Manor roundabout, which is tricky to say the least (sometimes, this is aided by pressing the pedestrian lights earlier, to create a pause in the traffic coming from the east). This probably gives me a false sense of safety. At other times, I am tempted to break the law by pressing the pedestrian lights, and getting home along the pavement outside the Manor Leisure Centre.

I also use the A27 at other times to get to Shoreham & back for social things at weekends & evenings.

Any future layouts of the A27 must consider the requirements of road users other than vehicles.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 939

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Traffic congestion is already bad on the A27 and the A259 through Lancing and Shoreham. The proposed development at New Monks Farm will make it worse due to increased traffic. Additional roundabouts and traffic lights do not help, as we can see clearly at bottle necks such as Downlands, Grove Lodge and Offington Corner. People will not use public transport and bicycles, however much the facilities are improved. They will use their cars.

The whole area is a flood plain. The land should be left clear to do its job. Building on the flood plain will cause water displacement. Even if the new properties were built to resist flooding, other residential areas across the flood plain would be in greater danger of flooding from the displaced water - it has to go somewhere!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Para 2.57 refers to the need for safe and improved pedestrian and cycle access across the A27 to the national park: we welcome this and its incorporation into Revised Draft Policy 5. We also welcome the intent to create a country park in association with this strategic development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 838

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We have extreme concerns and objections to the New Monks Farm (Policy 5), the Airport (Policy 7) and A27 proposals in the revised plan.

It is important that you note on your file items 4, 5 & 6 below.

As anyone would understand, if you have invested significant funds in your ideal home, in a secluded location, with complete privacy, surrounded by nature, open fields which abound with wild life, all which of could change at a stroke, you would be worried. We have the risk of losing hundreds of thousands of pounds of value in our property with absolutely no redress if the proposals proceed.

Such a development would severely blight our home and devalue it to a point where it could be approaching a negative equity situation.

Whether we could be termed 'nimbyies' or not; the proposed sites for development are totally flawed in terms of their sustainability and acceptability in every aspect.

Putting aside our very personal losses there are major concerns with the policies 5 & 7 proposals of the revised plan..

Because of these, we categorically object to both these developments

These are the reasons:-

#### 1) Flood Risk

Last winter from Christmas into the New Year, we also experienced severe water logging polluted by sewage and loss of toilet facilities. Our cesspool drainage was inundated for 8 weeks of that period. Southern Water, although not in their remit, kindly pumped out our cesspool 3 times to no avail because ground water levels soon inundated the cesspool after each emptying. Pumping equipment connected with this drainage tank was caused to fail which cost us some few hundred pounds to replace. We have lived here for almost 7 years and have never seen flooding to the extent experienced in our area.

We are currently surrounded by open fields/green space. We ask the question. If 600 homes and 10,000 sq m of business development are built around us just how can Adur justify this in terms of flood risk when so much concrete will be dropped into this very active and fragile flood plain. Is Adur happy to give us the Christmas experience as a regular event whenever we have periods of prolonged or heavy rainfall? Let alone the new builds who will experience the same flood risk to their new properties which will probably become uninsurable and as a result unsaleable.

Already the authority has permitted a golf course (whose owner and developer of it and the proposed development area has frequently boasted to local residents that it will never be finished and the area will be built upon), and an enormous football complex. Both these sites have severely affected the drainage of this area and, since we have lived here, we can see the change in the drainage levels as a direct result.

The proposed 15,000 sq m of business development on the Airport is unacceptable for exactly the same reasons. Every part of this flood plain is

connected through the Lancing Brooks ditch network. Wherever you build will severely affect both upstream and downstream in such a shallow floodplain.

The golf course has a fall of less than 3" across its 173 acres. From the plan, at least 60% of the NMF development will occupy its western side up to Mash Barn Lane. We also understand that the golf course drainage scheme may not have been completed to the approved specification. 12 ponds, to relieve in wet weather the many ditches across it, do not appear to have been constructed. Unquestionably, this will have greatly contributed to the Christmas period flooding of this north side of the flood plain and ongoing flood risk.

There are key drainage ditches flowing north to south from the A27 on both sides of the Mash Barn Lane which ultimately connect with the Lancing ditch network across the so called golf course. Any attempt to alter these ditches and their flows in the name of design layout of the development is asking for trouble and culverting certainly is not a solution. Any culverts will mean that ground water flows will suffer even further and cause issues both upstream and downstream of the area.

Quite frankly, we have absolutely no confidence in the developer to provide a mitigation scheme because we know from living here, this simply cannot be achieved.

There are many examples nationally of just this situation where the agencies and developers have got it so wrong and the poor public has suffered greatly, all in the cause of unscrupulous profit gain with no recourse for those so badly affected. This is exactly the case for these proposed developments.

As rate paying residents, we demand that the NMF and airport developments must be excluded from the Adur Plan to ensure no greater flood risk than already exists and for our continued wellbeing and that of all the local properties here in North Lancing and around the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

## 2) Roundabout Developments on the A27 (Map 7)

All we can say to this is Madness! Madness! Madness!

How on earth can the additional traffic generated by both these sites be managed on what is a major trunk road at absolute capacity right now and getting worse.

We still have to see the effect of the additional daily traffic flows from the Albion football centre with its space for 300+ car parking spaces. Despite the highways approval, that will only add further delays and gridlock to this trunk road, one of the busiest in the country.

We understand that the Highways Agency has given comments with certain conditions that one of the roundabout options will be acceptable. Are they mad??!! Yes, we do need regeneration of the businesses already in the area, particularly in the Lancing centre. Adding this phenomenal increase of traffic into the area plus the further delays of a roundabout will guarantee the further downhill decline of the Lancing businesses already struggling to maintain their survival. We must look after their interests; which ultimately is to the benefit of the community living here.

Creating a situation like there is with the A27 around Chichester will guarantee that companies looking to set up in the region will not give us a second glance but steer well clear of Adur and Lancing particularly.

The inconsistency of the Highways Agency beggars belief. They successfully objected to a planning application for 100 houses on virtually the

same area just 7 years ago because of the effect of increased traffic flows onto this Lancing stretch of the A27. And now they say the phenomenal increase from 600 house and high volume business developments and a school are acceptable!

They could not even get the drainage working when they carried out drainage improvement works on the same stretch for 3 months up to last Christmas. They failed to check that the outfalls were working but just assumed they were – and look at the road flooding that caused!

We have absolutely no faith in the Highways Agency.

If a roundabout is permitted, the only word for this is degeneration not regeneration!!

### 3) Loss of Wildlife

In both these areas there is a high level of wild life which use these natural green spaces and drainage ditches as their habitat. Frequently, roe deer are welcomed by residents in the Old Shoreham Road, They even come into their back gardens (see attached picture.), there are badgers(protected), foxes, invertebrates in profusion, protected water voles, crested newts (protected) lapwings (protected) - particularly around the policy 7 area, slow worms, grass snakes and innumerable species of birds.

Turning this area into building development will eliminate the habitat for these much loved indigenous species. They are another reason we decided to make our home here.

Restricting their presence to a limited bio diverse area behind the Old Shoreham Road will spell the death knell for these creatures. As part of their requirement to survive, many need to move uninhibited around the total green space which currently exists. This has already been eroded by the Albion complex. Being constricted to just the small 'bio area' mentioned with no chance to roam south or east because a building development is in the way will mean their ability to survive is at great risk and many will inevitably meet their demise..

We must protect our natural wildlife for future generations at all costs. If it cannot be protected in its own right – and we know that much of it can, then Adur has the arguments with drainage and infrastructure issues to prevent this damage to the wild life. They must exercise those arguments to the fullest extent.

I would imagine that part of the planning requirement for any development would be to check

- a) the financial viability of the developer
- b) check any financial charges which appertain to the land being developed.

In conclusion, we once again stress our strenuous opposition to the developments on New Monks Farm & the airport and the resulting roundabout. The councillors who represent the community here have no option but to listen to community concerns and delete these sites from the Adur Plan to ensure the wellbeing of us all. They must defend this robustly to the government inspectors.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 943

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Helifly (UK) Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

SEE EMAIL FOR MAP

I would like to make some comments concerning the proposed housing development of New Monks Farm. I am neither supporting nor objecting to the development, but commenting on the proposal and its effect on helicopter operations and pilot / passenger / resident safety.

The current helicopter circuits at Shoreham (larger version available here).

The map above shows the typical helicopter circuits to be flown by helicopters when arriving and departing the airfield and those to be strictly followed by students learning to fly. These are depicted by the red and maroon shapes.

The circuit pattern to be followed is decided by the wind conditions of the day and the runway then designated as primary runway by Air Traffic Control (ATC). There are two main runways at Shoreham used by the fixed wing aircraft (02/20 & 07/25) and the two helicopter circuits provide separation for helicopter traffic from fixed wing traffic.

As can be seen from the map the helicopter circuit has been designed to avoid as much of the current built up area as possible both to minimise environmental noise and to provide a safe landing area should the pilot experience problems.

The New Monks Farm development will be under both of these circuit patterns and noise pollution will be inevitable for those living on the development. Helicopters would typically be at between 400 & 500ft at that phase of their circuit (and are restricted by the operating rules at the airfield to a maximum height of 600ft – unless they are cleared break this restriction by ATC).

Students flying solo circuits may often be lower than this as they are very aware that breaking the 600ft rule is both dangerous (as it breaks the separation between the fixed wing and helicopter circuits) and can mean ATC report them for breaking aerodrome regulations. This means they can often be a 300 – 400ft over this piece of land. [This does not break any Aviation Law as they are in the process of taking off or landing and are therefore exempt from any minimum height.]

It is, therefore, plain that any development of this land should come with a covenant saying no complaint can be made against the airfield in relation to aircraft noise. It is to be expected and is part of the intrinsic charm of the area! After all, the airfield has been there almost 100 years longer than the proposed development.

There are also safety concerns in relation the proposed development. It is well known that the take-off and landing phases are the most dangerous during any flight, whether it be fixed wing or rotary. Having open land around an airfield allows the pilot a chance to reject a take-off or landing and, with good judgement (and some luck), get back to the surface safely. Without that open ground a pilot's options are severely limited.

Most aircraft (both helicopters and fixed wing) that operate from Shoreham are single engine. A failure or malfunction during take-off requires immediate action if any form of controlled emergency landing is to take place. Contrary to popular opinion and Hollywood's brainwashing, a helicopter does not fall out of the sky if the engine fails. The pilot (should) enter an autorotation and the helicopter then "glides" back to earth.

However, this is a steep descent and the rate of descent is only stopped just before touchdown using the last of the momentum in the rotor head.

The typical rate of descent of a helicopter in autorotation is around 1,500ft/min. Having identified an engine failure the pilot would be expected to; enter autorotation, choose a landing site and fly the appropriate profile, issue a mayday call, brief any passengers to brace, configure the helicopter such as to minimise the chance of a post crash fire and then perform the landing. Over the New Monks Farm the pilot will be at a maximum of 500ft and will have 20 seconds to complete these tasks. Less time than it's (probably) taken to read this paragraph!

The most important two items to be completed are to enter autorotation and choose a landing site. Currently we have open ground before and after the A27 giving some forced landing options. Once this development is in place there may not be time for the pilot to do anything other than make a forced landing in the development.

The helicopter circuits could be modified to some extent in order to minimise these risks, but there is a limit to what could be achieved whilst making the circuit suitable and safe to fly.

Just as living close to a river risks occasional flooding, living close to an airfield involves aircraft noise and a higher risk of being involved in an aviation incident. It would not be fair for residents to influence the businesses and operations of the airfield having chosen to live close to it themselves. This is also a position that governmental bodies should adopt should disputes arise.

Consideration should be taken when planning this park that it is not designed to attract too much wild fowl or birds. Airports and birds are a poor mix and many crashes have occurred after bird strikes on take-off or landing.

The airfield already has to play bird distress calls from an airport vehicle to clear hazardous flocks. To encourage even more birds to the locality can only increase the problem and the associated risks to those flying and living in the vicinity.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The supporting text accurately provides an overview of the environmental issues associated with this site. We are supportive of the requirement to reduce off site flood risk where possible and the need to retain existing on site drainage. We consider this Policy will ensure flood risk is adequately mitigated and reduced where possible, and will also deliver the enhancement of existing water bodies for both drainage and ecological benefits.

You may wish to include additional justification for allocating this site within the supporting text by making reference to the Sequential Test.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 834

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am totally against the Monks Farm development which is concreting over our precious green land between Lancing and Shoreham for the following reasons:

1. Loss of greenfield

2. Impact on the A27 which has not been properly assessed as traffic disruption every night at 5-6pm. Traffic from the east is already blocked from the Lancing roundabout to the Sussex Pad and 450-600 homes + industrial to be situated with the access being the A27 is going to have a detrimental impact on the journey of 1000's of drivers every night forever. You are suggesting a development which may not even be feasible because of a future transport assessment.

3. The roundabout proposed either on top of the Lancing roundabout or at the Sussex Pad will greatly affect all existing users of the airport. They will be inconvenienced forever for homes which are not yet built. In other words, everybody must be inconvenienced who use this area/route at present for the sake of development.

4. More land for homes on a country park will be less emergency areas for the airport air traffic should they have difficulty.

5. I do not want the council to roll over everytime central government want to waste our area. We have lost 50% to the National Park, so let's protect the remaining green area that is south of the A27. Once its gone a beautiful site looking from the Downs to the sea is lost forever.

6. It's a lazy piece of planning allocating a greenfield site for so many houses plus industry to access the A27. Utmost efforts should be made to have the homes/offices (utilising apartment-style building if required) distributed throughout our district thus minimising and spreading traffic for new homes and industry without creating bottle necks.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 830

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Monks Farm is in a flood plain. To build on it, no matter what flood prevention measures are made, would be to increase greatly the risk of flooding, not just to the new houses but also to existing housing in the area, an area already prone to flooding.

An additional problem would be the increased strain that the increase in population would place on an already overburdened infrastructure, especially roads, e.g. the A27. It would also place unacceptable strains on other services, such as schools, health, police and fire services.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 954

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

After reading the plan in whole I cannot believe that anyone would consider this as an acceptable plan for this area. I relate mainly to the plans for Lancing and Sompting. I will try to explain why this proposed plan cannot be allowed to go through. Having lived in Sompting Village for 15 years I have already noticed a big change to the area. The build of new properties in West St a few years ago has already stretched our village to capacity. Local schools, doctors, dentists all complain that they are overfilled and overstretched. I have recently had to use my local doctor, dentist and Worthing hospital. I cannot see how increasing the amount of people living in the area will help in any way. As for my main concern I can't think how anyone knowing this area could not realise what this will do to local traffic and roads. In the big picture, We are, by location, hindered by having the downs just to the north and the sea to the south. With Sompting being the "pinch point" of the traffic problems. With only two roads cover west-east this has been a long term problem. The A27 CANNOT take any more traffic. It already uses Sompting Village as a semi by pass! As a local Driving Instructor, I see how this has affected our local roads including Loose Lane. The addition of Worthing College moving to Grove Lodge has just made a bad situation worse. The state of the roads around West Street near the entrance to the village itself shows how this area can not take all this traffic. As this is all local bus routes it must hinder the bus service every day. The A27 and West Street can not take the current levels of traffic. This would need to be resolved LONG before anyone could think of adding properties to the Sompting and Lancing area. As for my road, Loose Lane, it is a narrow but already busy road with buses having to "squeeze" through especially at bust times ie rush hours and school times. Adding nearly 500 homes and using Loose Lane as an entrance to this estate has major traffic concerns as well as safety worries with the school nearby.

That states my physical concerns but please also note my emotional worries. When I moved to Sompting, it was mainly decided because of its quiet "village" feel. It has been a nice place to live without being miles from all we need. Good shops nearby but access to walks and wildlife on our doorstep. The new development around West St has already changed the village feel to the area. With this new proposal, I think we could forget our village status and just consider ourselves an extension of Worthing! WE WANT TO STAY AS A VILLAGE!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 825

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

Could I ask that the following concerns that I have regarding the above be included in the consultation file. Also would you be kind enough to confirm you can accept it and add it to you file. Thank you.

I have serious concerns and objections to developments on the New Monks Farm (Policy 5), the Airport (Policy 7) and A27 proposals in the revised plan.

I can only object to these proposals which will severely affect our quality of life. Having lived here for many years in this tranquil environment, surrounded by fields and wildlife to be surrounded by a 600 home development, a third of which will be 'affordable' (social) housing plus 10,000 sq m of business development will absolutely decimate my well being which has already been damaged by the approval of the football complex.

Irrespective of my personal situation the Adur Plan by inclusion of both the New Monks Farm and airport areas is totally flawed in every aspect. Apart from the adverse affect on the quality of life for the whole area including mine, these proposals simply do not comply with the NPPF for the following very obvious reasons:

#### 1) Flood Risk

If 600 homes and 10,000 sq m of business development are built here, how can the local authority justify this in terms of flood risk. You do not have to be a drainage expert to realise that when so much concrete is dropped into this very active and fragile flood plain, the water logging we experienced at Christmas for 8 weeks into the New Year will become a regular event. Any prolonged period of heavy rain will mean not only flooding of existing properties but all those homes which are being proposed.

I know that mitigation in this high risk of flooding area will not be possible as has been proven so many times elsewhere with the flooding of New Builds in flood plain situations where agencies have approved developer's solutions which have failed totally and miserably to the complete detriment of the community. If this development goes ahead, properties will be uninsurable and therefore unsaleable.

The proposed 15,000 sq m of business development on the Airport is unacceptable for exactly the same reasons. Every part of this flood plain is connected through the Lancing Brooks ditch network. Wherever you build will severely affect both upstream and downstream in such a shallow floodplain.

I understand from the plans that up to 60% of the proposed New Monks Farm development will be located on the western section of what is meant to be a golf course. Already it has been established that despite building up the land, 12 key ponds to mitigate for when ditch levels are high have not been completed. This inevitably was contributory to last winter's drainage problems. Building up to 300+ homes in this area is pure madness! The drainage fall across the whole of the golf course site is under 3 inches! This is the key wetland area which should be let to flood in times of bad wet weather. Only devastation will result if building is permitted.

As a rate paying resident, I think that the NMF and airport developments must be excluded from the Adur Plan to ensure no greater flood risk than already exists and for my continued wellbeing and that of all the local properties here in North Lancing and all around the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

#### 2) A27 Roundabout (Map 7)

This major road is already at over capacity now. How on earth can the additional traffic output from the NMF and airport developments be acceptable to the Highways Agency with a roundabout on the A27. I cannot believe that any 'improvements' can help ease the situation, it can only get a lot worse.

We have still to see the effect of the additional traffic flows from the football complex let alone these proposed developments.

If this goes ahead I can only foresee gridlock and flooded roads as a result .

I have no faith in the Highways Agency if they find this to be acceptable, particularly after their management of the improvement works last Autumn which resulted in worse flooding on the Lancing stretch of the A27.

### 3) Decimation of the Wildlife

The whole flood plain is full of wildlife, whose habitat is already eroded by the building of the football complex to the south.

Many species, a lot of them protected by law are present in this area. Once again, despite the planners' words of managing the outfall for wild life from such developments, these poor creatures will only suffer if these totally inappropriate developments proceed. Many animals need the whole area to forage. With confinement to a so called bio diverse area many will not survive and with a large building development preventing their movement across the Lancing Gap will only mean one thing – their total demise!

We must protect our natural wildlife for future generations at all costs. If it cannot be protected in its own right – and we know that much of it can, then Adur has the arguments with drainage and infrastructure issues to prevent this damage to the wild life. They must exercise those arguments to the fullest extent.

Finally, I once again stress our vehement opposition to the developments on New Monks Farm and the airport and the resulting roundabout, none of which conforms to the NPPF. We insist that councillors who represent the community here must listen to community concerns. These sites must be deleted from the Adur Plan to ensure the wellbeing of us all. This must be robustly defended to the government inspectors.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 953

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have lived in my home next to the A27 for 31 years and over that time there have been numerous incidents of flooding in nearby properties. I am fortunate never to have been directly affected, however for those who have been the experience has been traumatic. I can only sympathise with the appalling, long-lasting problems that foul water inundating one's property present. If we didn't live on a flood plain life would be quite different in prolonged wet weather.

It therefore beggars belief that plans exist to build up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5), a school, community centre, 10,000 sq.m. of business development together with the associated road infrastructure. Surely this would create an unacceptable risk of flood for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern perimeters of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plan.

The same applies to the 15,000 sq.m. proposed development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

The draft plan has completely neglected to take account of the Christmas flooding event that has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation in periods of sustained wet weather will be impossible. How much more proof is needed?

If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters. Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over the Christmas and New Year periods.

Although on the south side Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan for 'technical reasons', any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park. Since the same 'technical reasons' apply to New Monks Farm and the airport developments they too must be removed from the plan.

Throughout the flood plain drainage problems will affect everyone - they are all interconnected by this fragile, wetland areas, which must be allowed to work as a flood plain to retain excess water during periods of wet weather.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 87

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are writing to state our objections to the plans at New Monks Farm, Lancing.

It would be reckless to even think of putting so many houses, a school and an industrial estate (or business area) on this land.

Firstly, it is a known flood area. It would not be fair to expect families, whether privately owned or with the Housing Association, to live there.

Insurance would be too high, if obtainable at all. This whole area is built on what were marshes; any more housing would cause a significant rise in water levels.

Secondly, there would be problems for the 'services', including water and sewage, as has already has been experienced in the area.

Thirdly, the notorious A27 between Shoreham and Lancing. The heavy traffic is now horrendous, with regular accidents, traffic queues occur daily - which spread into Lancing via Grinstead Lane and down to the A24 coast road, etc. An important question would be how the traffic would come through the Estate? Should an area of the Northern end of Shadwells Road with Hayley Road be opened up for buses or emergency vehicles? The roads here on the estate are too small.

There is only one answer to this plan - objection against on all counts.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 421

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Monks Farm is in a flood plain. To build on it no matter what flood prevention measures are made would be to increase greatly the risk of flooding - not just to the houses, but also to the existing houses in the area, which are already prone to flooding. The proposed development of 600 houses is simply too many!!

An additional problem would be placed on an already overburdened infrastructure of roads esp. A27, health GP services, schools, and police services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 422

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Monks Farm is in a flood plain. To build on it no matter what flood prevention measures are made would be to increase greatly the risk of flooding - not just to the houses, but also to the existing houses in the area, which are already prone to flooding. The proposed development of 600 houses is simply too many!!

An additional problem would place on already overburdened infrastructure, especially the roads - A27, etc.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 790

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I don't think that this project should go ahead as we already have a flooding/drainage problem on the West Beach Estate and by building on the flood plains which are supposed to protect your houses, the flooding issue is going to be made 100% worse and the whole estate will be badly flooded!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 945

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having experienced severe drainage problems from Summer 2012 through to the early part of 2013 we are strongly objecting to the development proposals in the Adur Draft Plan for the New Monks Farm and Airport areas (Policies 5 & 7).

Building up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5) with a school, community centre, 10,000 sq metres of business development plus all the road infrastructure will create an absolutely unacceptable flood risk for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern perimeters of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain..

The same applies to the 15,000 sq metres of proposed business development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

We experienced 8 weeks of devastation last Christmas with serious flooding, loss of sewerage and gas and know instinctively that the agencies and developers simply cannot mitigate this flood risk in such a shallow fall flood plain – 4 feet fall across 2 miles to the Shoreham sluices. It's a planning policy built on lunacy.

The draft plan has absolutely neglected to take account of this Christmas flooding event which has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds of the ratepayers' money to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation will be impossible in periods of sustained wet weather. How much more proof is required?

There are many similar examples nationally where so called mitigation has been actioned by the Environment Agency and developers with disastrous outcomes for home owners with no recourse for damage – Redcar on Teeside and St Asaph in Denbighshire are just two such examples.

If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area, whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters.

Even though on the south side, for 'technical reasons', Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan, any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park. All areas in Lancing are interconnected by one thing – a flood plain.

The same 'technical reasons' must apply to New Monks Farm and the airport developments and they must be taken out of the plan

Whatever the so called experts say, we have absolutely no confidence in their judgement that flood risk in this area can be mitigated for.

Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas and into the New Year and defend their action to Government to exclude this flood plain development from the plan.

In terms of infrastructure, it is completely unacceptable to even contemplate a roundabout (Map7) on this stretch of the A27. The road is at over capacity now.

Seven years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected by the Highways Agency. This was the main reason a hearing upheld the decision to not approve the application.

If the A27 then was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes, how can it approve the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed. Together with the proposed roundabout, this is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council, its councillors and officers have no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its rate paying community.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 788

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation PerryAir Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### OBJECTIONS TO THE BUILDINGS OF HOUSES AT MONKS FARM:

A) The area is a known and historically established flood plain, both tidally flooded and water draining from the South Downs and Springs running into the same area.

B) The area is an established force landing area used by pilots experiencing problems after take off.

C) The helicopter circuit flies over that area at low level, this is a safety factor as well as a potential for noise complaints directed at the airport and operators causing more restrictions and loss of income to both parties.

D) The encroaching into the 'green gap' between Lancing and Shoreham and the ruining of views from the South Downs 'area of outstanding natural beauty' as has the football academy.

E) These developments will add to the danger of flooding neighbours and the airport by increasing the covered area i.e. reducing the sink away area available.

Both Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport developments will only add to the already over congested A259 and A27 which have become almost unusable at certain peak times and are always busy at any time.

This already detracts from the area and will cause further distraction, misery and frustration to established business and residents in the locality.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 947

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I would like to register my objection to the proposed development on the New Monks Farm site for the following main reasons.

A) After previous years of local flooding I can only imagine that further building can only exacerbate the problem further. Has this serious issue been closely investigated taking into account the history of the site as well as the current drainage problems?

B) Can the A27 cope with a further addition of a possible 1,200+ cars per day plus extra service vehicles etc in both easterly and westerly directions? As it is, very locally, the Lancing Manor roundabout gets completely blovked for a considerable time during rush hours.

I am also registering my objection for the development of 'business buildings' on the Shoreham Airport site for similar reasons as above i.e. flooding and extra traffic onto the A27.

Also it is sure to affect the riverside wildlife with much more activity close to the river. I don't consider such buildings appropriate on the site which at the moment contributes to the welcome green belt between the built up areas of Lancing and Shoreham.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 787

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the development of New Monks Farm as this risks flooding of the surrounding area by displacing water and creating more run off from the hard surfaces. At times of heavy or prolonged rainfall the water table rises considerably even without the effect of this huge amount of development on what is a flood plain. If this plan is adopted or forced upon us of who do we seek legal redress for this reckless proposal?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 740

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Do not build on New Monks Farm flood plain. We will flood!

I have lived on West Beach for 38 years, where we have only just managed to keep its constant flooding at high tide/during heavy rains from entering our homes with the help of the flood plains. This includes New Monks Farm.

As I write this today the water is now up over the pavement heading towards my front door. Will I find water in the near future seeping up through my floorboards?

This Estate lies lower than New Monks Farm so all excess water will head this way.

Ask yourself, councillors, how would you feel if this was your home? Will the council take responsibility for our house insurance when we can no longer obtain it?

Don't lets forget all the traffic, where will approx. 2000 extra vehicles go each day, on the A27/A259?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 829

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Monks Farm is in a flood plain. To build up to 600 houses on it, no matter what flood prevention measures are made, would be to increase greatly the risk of flooding, not just to the new houses but also to existing housing in the area, an area already prone to flooding.

An additional problem would be the increased strain that the increase in population would place on an already overburdened infrastructure, especially roads. This area suffers from severe congestion already.

It would also place unacceptable strains on other services, such as schools, health, police and fire services.

The negative environmental impact to local wildlife and fauna should also be considered.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1106

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

The Coastal strip is already overcrowded and cannot support further development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1092

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1093

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

The green gap between Lancing & Shoreham is a flood plain and should stay as such. Do not put a load of houses on it and damage the environment and wildlife. Humans aren't the only people on this planet.

What we went through last Christmas says it all.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1094

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1095

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1096

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1097

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1098

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1099

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

An awful decision - should this be passed?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1100

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1101

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1102

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

It is of particular concern regarding the building of such a development on a flood plain and the impact on an overcrowded A27 already overstretched.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1103

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

2.53 Current thinking allows 2 cars per household in this part of England. Therefore, 900-1200 extra domestic vehicles plus visitors, commercial vehicles etc. moving in and out of that site will create traffic chaos. When there is an accident or roadworks (as recently), traffic moves to the already congested A259. Roundabouts don't move excessive numbers of vehicles more quickly – see Chichester by-pass at peak hours and every day in summer.

2.54 The 'Virtual Golf Course' is owned by a developer. The reason it has not been completed is obvious: the company/individual is waiting for an opportunity to apply to build houses instead – makes the land much more valuable and they already have their 'foot in the door'. What does the Council think will happen to all the soil that has been dumped on land designated 'Golf Course'. The area is still flood plain at present.

2.55 Of course it is low and flat – it is FLOOD PLAIN. That might make it 'low sensitivity' from the aesthetic viewpoint, but it doesn't make it 'low importance' from the point of view of flood protection.

2.56 Important network of streams for biodiversity habitats will be abused by builders and residents if houses are built around them. In 1993/4 Chichester was severely flooded by the River Lavant the channel of which was blocked by detritus and plant growth. Historically, the City had been flooded every 30 years (approximately) by this tiny watercourse (ask Environment Agency for details). The streams at NMF contain water much of the time but there is no flow due to the very slight gradient to the sluice about 2 miles east. An event similar to Chichester in 1993/4 would almost certainly flood homes because the water would have nowhere else to go once it overflowed its channel.

2.57 A few years ago it is believed that the Highways Agency opposed the proposed building of 100 homes at Manor Close because of the increase to traffic on A27. Why are 450-600 homes now acceptable? A roundabout east of Grinstead Lane will not mitigate this. A27 at Lyons Farm and Grove Lodge is a nightmare and these proposals will create further traffic chaos. Currently traffic is diverted from A27 to A259, or vice versa, at times of roadworks etc. That will create gridlock from Worthing to beyond Shoreham if these plans go ahead.

2.58 In the real world, people in the proposed new homes will use their cars. Public transport is unreliable and there are still more cars on roads than people using public transport. Even if they want to go by train, the residents would have to go to the station by car unless they had unlimited time to wait for a bus.

2.59 Who is going to police these accesses to ensure they are not used as 'rat runs'?

2.60 How can you mitigate for existing traffic? That is the number of vehicles that use the junction daily, how will anyone make them move faster especially when there will be another roundabout to the east which will slow traffic flow even more?

2.61 Across England, homes built on Flood Plains are flooded no matter how much the owners are assured that mitigation measures have been put in place. Insurance Companies are increasing premiums to ALL homeowners to cover flooding costs but it is believed that new homes built on flood plains since the agreement with Government, will have no cap on the levy insurance companies can charge. New occupiers will have to pay whatever the insurance company demands or risk not having insurance. If this building causes flooding elsewhere on the flood plain, residents of Hasler Estate could have their homes flooded (not just the roads), for the first time in up to 80 years. Will the Council be responsible for that?

2.65 Wonderful news to have a permanent traveller site on NMF, they will be able to trash the new country park area instead of other parks in the Borough where they have been before. This will create a permanent risk of burglary, damage. Traveller sites should be well outside residential areas.

REVISED DRAFT PLAN POLICY 5: Forgive the cynicism but 'travel behaviour initiatives' sounds like a lot of words with no meaning. You cannot make people use 'sustainable transport' the majority will use their cars no matter what is said. You have not said what mitigation measures would be put in place against any of the potential problems listed in this plan. Without details, no one can counter your statements.

To return to flooding, SUDS for pluvial/fluviol flooding is popular with developers but a brand new system assessed as having sufficient capacity for any expected event recently proved woefully inadequate and new homes were flooded (recent news report). In order to install such a system, the

storage tank has to be sunk some metres into the ground and that would disrupt groundwater flows on this flood plain. No one, no matter who you name, can protect against groundwater. Homes at risk will find water coming up through their floorboards and in through airbricks no matter how many flood defence systems are in place. Water in the environment will not go away or reduce in volume, it will find another way round obstructions. Someone will be flooded as well as (if not instead of) the proposed new homes. Please learn from the mistakes of others.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1105

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

The 'gaps' are constantly being diminished already!

Grinstead Lane is on its way to becoming a motorway!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1089

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1107

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

Flood plain should be maintained as such. There is already flooding in the vicinity.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1108

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1109

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

The flood plain is there for a reason. Grinstead Lane has already been flooded several times in the last few years.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1110

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1111

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1112

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1113

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1114

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1115

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1116

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1117

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1118

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1104

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1076

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1062

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1063

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1064

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1065

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1066

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1067

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 86

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Object to building on new Monks Farm:

No more building on our flood plain

The flood plain protects our homes

Any more building and we will flood

Traffic congestion - there are enough problems in this area without added traffic caused by new buildings

Disruption to local roads.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1069

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 518

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I live on Grinstead Lane in Lancing and am very concerned regarding the proposals made for the reasons set out below:

Grinstead Lane is far too busy, heavy traffic including big HGVs all day long. This can only get worse due to more traffic in general; therefore more pollution and more noise. This is unavoidable.

However, to build 600 houses, a school and a community centre is going to cause far more traffic. 600 houses will use a minimum of 600 cars, just look at Grinstead Lane - many have 2, some have 3 cars per home. Why should the new residents be any different? You can't make people walk, cycle or use the bus. So the surrounding area, including my road, Grinstead Lane, will be unbearably noisy with traffic pollution, ultimately causing poor health.

This is enough of a reason to change the proposal and desist from building. Nonetheless, there is another even more worrying issue to do with the risk of increased flooding of the area flanked by Grinstead Lane, A27, the River Adur and the sea.

According to the Environment Agency, the area flanked by Grinstead Lane, A27, the River Adur and the sea are "an area at higher risk of flooding based on our records and prediction of likely flooding". We know this is a real threat, look back to last Christmas, Grinstead Lane flooded from Curvins Way to A27, Manor Way flooded with tankers outside emptying the drains for many days, gas pipes eroded in floodwater, and Gas workers digging up a flooded road on Christmas Day.

It has been worse, in 2001 there was flooding for over 2 months on Grinstead Lane and Manor Way area. The people of West Beach (South Lancing) have only just earlier this month had their road flooded. So WE know the Environment Agency are not exaggerating, does the local council think they are? If 600 houses, a school and a community centre are built on a floodplain, then we will really find out how bad it can get. Will the Council help us all (I mean 'all' as in the area mentioned above which will include the 600 houses, a school and a community centre) with our damaged properties and house insurance problems which are bound to arise? In any case, why would anyone want to live on a floodplain (New Monks Farm).

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1071

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1072

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1073

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1091

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

On no account should there be any further building in this area. The flooding was horrendous for residents last year, more building will exacerbate this.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1075

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1090

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1077

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1078

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1079

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1080

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1081

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1082

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1083

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1084

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1085

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1086

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1087

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1088

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1122

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1074

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 12

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment regarding the proposed development on the “New Monks Farm” site and a further development planned for the north east side of the airport. I notice these developments appear to be creating quite a ‘stir’ as evidenced by the recent articles in the local newspapers and the objections raised by several resident’s associations.

The reasons for this email are twofold; firstly I wish to voice my strong objections and opposition to these proposed developments and secondly I wish to seek answers to a few questions please.

I have to admit to being very surprised that such ambitious developments are being considered so soon after the floods which wreaked havoc on the community of Lancing only 9 months ago. As these floods were attributed to the precarious environmental factors in the area I am further surprised that these developments are being considered especially as the root causes of the problems appear to remain unresolved. It seems a little nonsensical to add to the problem by increasing development without first resolving the underlying flood dangers.

My home was one of the unfortunate victims of the recent flooding where raw sewage, lack of gas and excessive water served to make for a thoroughly unpleasant Christmas for my family and many of my neighbours. The cause of this flooding appears to be the fragile flood plains in and around the Lancing area and the delicate balance between nature and mans inability to mitigate against her forces by over developing this obviously ‘at-risk’ area. You can hopefully understand therefore, my concerns that despite clear evidence that the flood plains have already been over developed, further development is being considered. Put bluntly, these developments will do nothing but exacerbate the already delicate balance in this area.

This proposed development has simply failed to take into account the displacement of ground and surface waters which leads me to my first question please. I would be grateful if you could explain your reasons, cited as “technical”, for no longer including Old Salts Farm as part of the development. If it is as a result of flood issues, as I suspect, then could I please ask that you accept that the entire flood plain is all interlinked and inter-connected and the plans to remove large chunks of the flood plain and replace it with concreted development will do nothing but compound the workings of a flood plain that has been proved to be insufficient in dealing with water drainage under current infrastructure arrangements.

Surely you must acknowledge that that the shallow flood fall in this area (4 feet:2 miles), combined with the fact that existing agencies appear to be unable to mitigate flooding and that residents have already experienced severe flooding demonstrates the peculiarly delicate balance of the area and that any further development must first address this flood issue. Given that the issue has not been resolved under the existing infrastructure footprint I fail to see how it will be improved by exacerbating the problem with more development. Put bluntly, it would be lunacy to continue to develop on an area that has already been proven to be broken.

I apologise for coming across so strongly here but the memories of the Christmas floods are still very vivid in my mind and the thought of serious flooding, loss of sewage and gas due to over ambitious development agendas makes my emotions run high.

Given the significant local objections to these proposed developments I would be interested to know how you intend to compensate residents if their concerns do indeed materialize, as I fully expect they will. I am particularly interested in how you intend to offset the inevitable higher insurance premiums and the equally inevitable drop in property prices brought on as a result of this self induced flood risk. Could I and other residents expect a drop in our council tax premiums to cover our additional costs and loss of revenues for example? I think I can speak with some authority that we

are now beyond “potential” risk to “evidenced real” risk. Your proposed development will surely, based on recent events, simply increase future flooding in the area and I have seen nothing in the proposed plans to convince me otherwise.

This leads to my final question please which relates to culpability. Put simply, I, like many others who are objecting to these developments and who have lived through flooding in this area, would wish to be reassured that any future developments will not contribute to further floods. Indeed, I would like to know what measures are being put in place to not only mitigate future flooding but more importantly eradicate future floods. Have you, for example, invested in, or instructed the developers to pay for, “independent” ecological surveys to assess the area for further development with regard to the flood plains. I am concerned that without these “independent” and “unbiased” specialist reports, then development will be approved based on profit margins rather than ecological impact statements. I stress the need for these reports to be independent and specialised; independent for obvious commercially linked reasons but also specialised to ensure the peculiar and unique nature of the area is fully considered by experts.

Ultimately, I want to know who is the person who will potentially give the go ahead for these developments because I for one will be extremely angry if development goes ahead and floods continue. It would make for an interesting legal case if any potential future flooding and their resultant damages could be linked to an individual or individuals not listening to and taking sufficient steps to mitigate flooding particularly in light of such strong local opposition and combined with such compelling evidence of previous flooding. I would like it recorded that I would much prefer you to spend my tax money on investigating how the flood plains can be repaired so that developments can be considered in the future rather than spending my taxes on the inevitable mopping-up operations and lengthy legal battles as a consequence of individuals who failed to listen to public opinion or specialist advice.

Moving on from the potentially catastrophic consequences of flooding, I see that the developments include the addition of a roundabout on the A27 in this same area. I am advised that some years ago (approximately 2006) a similar development of only 100 homes was rejected by the Highways Agency due to traffic density. I regret I don't have the time nor the inclination to research this in detail but I suspect that traffic density will have only increased since 2006 and that this would be compounded by the new development particularly as it is considerably more ambitious than 100 homes. Common sense surely must dictate that if the roads were not able to support 100 homes how on earth can they support 600, plus amenities, plus a large business development plus an inevitable uplift in traffic – it just does not make any sense at all. The road is already congested, particularly at commuter times, and this slowing down of the road by placing obstacles in it in the form of roundabouts will do nothing but congest it further. Once again I must reiterate that I simply fail to see the sense in this proposal other than to support a development that has not been thought through?

In summary, whilst I accept the proposed developments may potentially be a lucrative proposition for some I would urge that common sense over profit prevails and existing residents are not subjected to further hardship as a consequence of ill informed decisions by the very people who are in office to protect my, and my neighbour's, interests.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1119

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1153

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1154

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1155

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1156

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1157

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1158

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1159

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1160

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1161

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1162

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

According to the Environment Agency, the area that includes Grinstead Lane, Mash Barn and South Lancing is "at higher risk of flooding based on our records and predictions of likely flooding". This area extends to the River Adur. Grinstead Land and Manor Way were flooding at Christmas last, South Lancing is flooded at the moment (see youtube 'New flooding in Lancing West Beach 4 Nov 13'). So WHY is the much needed flood plain being built on? As for heavy constant traffic and pollution, Grinstead Lane is becoming unbearable - NO MORE TRAFFIC + POLLUTION!

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We give below our objections to the Draft Adur Plan, particularly where it refers to the proposal to build up to 600 houses in the Monks Farm area along with 10,000 sq. meters of business space and a school.

1. It is accepted that Central Government places a responsibility upon local government to provide houses where a need exists for more accommodation. What we do not accept is, firstly, that, in Adur district, there is a need for housing of the magnitude estimated by the plan. Secondly, it is nonsense for any local authority to take the view that, where a need is identified, it is incumbent upon them to build in areas which, for a variety of reasons, may be totally unsuitable, or that Central Government could insist upon such action. The fact of the matter is that this part of the South Coast is effectively "full" and the forcing of further buildings, people and traffic into the area can only exacerbate an overcrowding problem that threatens to gridlock us completely.

2. Those of us who lived through the severe flooding problems experienced over Christmas last year, and into 2013, find the planners' apparent total disregard of the effect that the proposed building will have on drainage in this area to be completely incomprehensible. The present drainage arrangements on this flood plain are already patently incapable of coping adequately with even moderate heavy rainfall and water flowing off the downs to the North. Covering with concrete an area of the size involved in the plan can only bring about the destruction of the ability of the land to dissipate excess water, and the result will be the inundation of all of the properties relying on the drainage system, including all of the new properties themselves.

3. The Association of British Insurers (ABI) have said that around one in six homes in England and Wales is at risk of flooding and the situation is worsening. The result of this is that the cost of flood insurance will become prohibitive in many cases and impossible in others. An agreement between insurers and the Government will alleviate this problem for some but 'new build' properties will be excluded. Flood insurance on new properties built on the Adur flood plain will, therefore, be unobtainable and this is bound to reflect upon the availability of mortgages for those properties. Where is the sense in insisting on building houses which cannot be sold?

4. The movement of traffic in the area is already a huge problem, especially at peak times. In the absence of a bypass around Worthing, or the reasonable prospect of one in the remotely foreseeable future, this situation can only be worsened by the building of more houses, with the associated ownership by the occupants of more vehicles. Journeys on the A27 trunk road and the A259 coast road already take far too long as a result of the volume of traffic. Adding more vehicles can only exacerbate this problem. The situation will, clearly be worsened by the construction of either of the two roundabouts suggested for the A27 trunk road, which incorporate the potential for major accidents.

5. Whilst recognising that environmental issues are very low in the consideration of planners, development on the scale suggested in the plan will sound a death knell to much of the livestock currently inhabiting the area, including deer, wildfowl, herons, badgers and foxes. This is to say nothing of the pleasure that so many of us receive from simply looking out onto what is presently greenery instead of yet more ugly brickwork.

For all of the above reasons, we object to any further building on the Adur flood plain, and in particular in the New Monks Farm area. Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1151

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 13

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to object most strongly to the proposed development on New Monks Farm and the Airport together with the roundabout proposals for the A27.

The plan makes absolutely no recognition of the severe drainage issues we experienced here in North Lancing over last Christmas into the New Year. I personally suffered tremendous hardship living in the lowest part of Manor Way. Not only did I lose use of toilet facilities but my garden was under 6 inches of water for much of the weeks of the event.

My garage and its contents which included a washing machine and a freezer were also flooded similarly. Fortunately they were on raised up areas above the water level and no damage was actually sustained to these appliances, although the electrical risk with so much water around was of great concern to myself. Loss of accessibility to both appliances was total and quite frankly unacceptable.

We live on the edge of a slow draining flood plain. It does not take a rocket scientist to know that the suggested developments on New Monks Farm (immediately to the east of here) and the airport will only further impair the surface and groundwater drainage in the area. The flood plain is what it says it is - an area where drainage can accumulate in periods of heavy wet weather without severely affecting the areas around it.

As our District Council I must insist that these two developments must be excluded from the Adur Draft Plan. The residents' wellbeing in the Lancing area must be looked after and not allowed to be sacrificed to developers whose only objective is to make enormous profits at the expense of the local community and

move on leaving us unable to arrange insurance cover and in constant fear of the consequences from the sort of terrible event we experienced over last Christmas. As for the idea of creating yet another roundabout on this already overloaded trunk road, this beggars belief.

Once again, as a long term resident in this area, I (and my neighbours) need your reassurance that the above proposed developments will be totally excluded from the plan and the reasons why vigorously supported to the government inspectors.

The Lancing/Shoreham gap must be preserved with no further development at all costs to ensure the wellbeing of the local community with no increased risks.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 1150

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 11

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

Waste of paper. The answer is no houses on golf course. It is ridiculous, we have flooding there.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I would like to express I do understand Adur's need for more houses, etc, but the real question where is it most appropriate. Where current homes experiencing flooding and is known as flood plain area - shows this land is not really suitable. I do feel there is land available which can accommodate the whole Adur Development Plan which should be considered first.

Building up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5) with a school, community centre, 10,000 sq metres of business development plus the road infrastructure will create an unacceptable flood risk for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern perimeters of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain flood plain.

The same applies to the 15,000 sq metres of proposed business development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

As a resident who lives north of the flood plain, having experienced 8 weeks of devastation last Christmas with serious flooding, loss of sewerage and gas I know instinctively that the agencies and developers simply cannot mitigate this flood risk in such a shallow fall flood plain – 4 feet fall across 2 miles to the Shoreham sluices. It's a planning policy built on lunacy.

The draft plan has absolutely neglected to take account of this Christmas flooding event which has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation will be impossible in periods of sustained wet weather. How much more proof is required? Remember this is NOT the first time.

Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas into the New Year. If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area, whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters.

Even though on the south side, for 'technical reasons', Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan, any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park.

The same 'technical reasons' apply to New Monks Farm and the airport developments and they must be taken out of the plan

Throughout the flood plain, drainage problems will affect everyone – they are all interconnected by this fragile, wetland area which must be allowed to work as a flood plain to retain excess water during periods of wet weather.

I have to say out of the 5 years I have lived in this area 10% of the time I have experienced problems with flooding, building more houses in area where the chances of flood have increase (up to 75% chance of flooding) is a invitation for more problems with flooding. I would say it unfair of Adur council expecting their residents to live like this!

In terms of infrastructure, it is completely unacceptable to even contemplate a roundabout (Map7) on this stretch of the A27. The road is at over capacity now.

Seven years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected by the Highways Agency. This was the main reason a hearing upheld the decision to not approve the application.

If the A27 then was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes, how can it approve the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed.

Together with the proposed roundabout, this is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

I feel A27 should really have some traffic control measures - a drop from 70mph to 40mph - its obvious motorist do not take any notice of the speed limit - especially the motorbikes as they see this stretch of the A27 as an initiation to put their foot down. This stretch of the A27 should have more speed control mechanisms.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council has no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its ratepaying

residents.

I would like to ask a question why other flood plain/flood risk areas have been excluded but not New Monks Farm where the same principles apply. I believe a precedent has been set - no building on Flood plain land including New Monks Farm !

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 8

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We would like to register our objection to the above-mentioned proposed plan.

Building a further 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site ( Policy 5 )with a school, community centre & 10,000 square metres of business development plus the road infrastructure will create an extra unacceptable flood risk for all the long suffering existing residents of Lancing and Shoreham.

The same applies to the proposed Business Development on the north eastern side of the airport ( Policy 7 ).

We live north of the flood plain and experienced 8 weeks of utter misery last Christmas because of serious flooding and loss of the use of toilets.

The area is already designated as a high probability (3a) flood zone. We cannot begin to comprehend what measures any developer or agency could take to reduce the risk of flooding. Surely adding dwellings, a school and business developments can only exacerbate an already untenable situation.

This is planning policy that shows no rationale. On the face of it, it would seem that the real concerns of the residents are simply not being taken into consideration – it is almost as if they do not matter. Put another way, it seems that the council have not thought out the consequences and the implications of the proposal enough, and if the plan were to be approved they would subject even more people to abject misery.

Regarding infrastructure, it is complete madness to even contemplate a roundabout ( Map 7 ) on this stretch of the A27. The road is already inadequate for the current volume of traffic it has to handle. Seven years ago a similar scheme was rejected by The Highways Agency. If it was incapable then of coping with the additional traffic from a hundred homes what circumstance in the interim period has changed so that it would now ( miraculously ) cope with the traffic from six hundred homes, a school and a business development ?

Additionally, it would be a lot more difficult for those residents who live alongside the A27 to access their homes

In the interest of the well-being of all the residents of Lancing there must be no further building on the Lancing / Shoreham flood plain.

Common sense dictates that Adur District Council should seriously consider the welfare of all its Council Tax Payers and propose an alternative plan that does not involve building on the flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 7

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The problems with the plan to place housing (and a school) in this area are actually listed within the document itself. The main concern is that the area is high risk flood area. Houses built next to this land already flood. Recent works to prevent the A27 flooding now mean that the water from there now runs onto this land, adding to the problem – local homes flooded last winter as a result of this. Surely it is more than clear that this plan would be detrimental to new home owners and more importantly, to current home owners.

The land is also part of the 'strategic' gap between Lancing and Shoreham which I believed were protected? A large piece of the strategic gap is already about to be built on by Brighton and Hove Albion. There will be no gap.

The local road infrastructure is already struggling to cope with traffic pressures. I cannot fathom how this could be built to ensure that things do not get any worse than they already are. Grinstead Lane can hold no more traffic – especially in rush hour and the Brighton Road is also very congested, particularly at rush hour too. These issues will discourage not encourage commuters from the area.

Adur is the most deprived area of West Sussex. Working families - commuters need to be encouraged to move here, not leave and I know of many who no longer see Lancing as a viable area to live and raise their families when investment into the area is so poor, schemes such as this are proposed with such apparent poor thought over the long term effects and commuting is so very difficult due to the road systems as they currently stand.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 112

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I also object to development on the Mash Barn Estate. Again causing more 'traffic delays/backlog/build up' along Grinstead Lane, and again onto the A27, both ways towards Worthing, Brighton, Shoreham. As you are aware the traffic in all these areas are bad/built up at all times of the day, especially rush hour and also when there are accidents into the tunnel towards Brighton. There is enough traffic in the area now and if more houses are built A27, Grinstead Road and surrounding areas will no longer be able to cope, as it can't cope now.

I do not have a reference number for these, but I wish to object amongst others. It will cause chaos for locals.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 596

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 5

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having already excluded the Hasler area [see 2.5] from building I am at a loss to understand why you have included the New Monks Farm/Mash Barn area.

1. Any additional building here will increase the flood problems both in the Mash Barn area and, potentially, exacerbate flooding problems in the Hasler area with surface water run off.
  2. The already congested A27 would be further congested by additional traffic from this area. An average of two cars per household could mean up to 1200 extra vehicles trying to get on and off the new site. Additional roundabouts have been proved at Chichester to do nothing but cause extra problems with traffic flow
  3. Building on this area will break through the natural clay level and allow ground water to come to the surface further adding to the run off problems in both the local area and further afield at Hasler.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are concerned about the number of assessments needed before this can become viable and had expected many should have been done before the plan has got to this stage

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 595

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 4

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

I am one of the families that suffered (and I mean suffered) the consequences of last Christmas flooding. I don't know, but I am assuming that the council representatives proposing this insane idea do not live in the area in question? The idea of building on a flood plain is as stupid as a chocolate teapot.

Apart from the building issue, what about the traffic increase that will follow? Anyone who uses the A27 will know that it is running (no pun intended) under pressure at peak times now. To increase the traffic on it is an accident waiting to happen. I understand that new houses must be built in the country, but 'ON A FLOOD PLAIN'? Come on!!!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 4

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I would like to express my objection to the proposal of houses being built on the Lancing flood plain. Regardless of the governments demand for more houses to be built, it would be madness to build on a flood plain. Where does the council think the water will go if they lay concrete on this land? Having gone through the nightmare of last Christmas flooding, (my neighbour had water rising through his kitchen floor boards, and manholes were overflowing), this will only exasperate the situation. There is also the traffic to consider, the A27 is running at maximum load now, and to increase the amount of traffic will only lead to larger traffic jams and an unbearable situation. Try travelling through Worthing on the A27 at peak times and you know what I mean.

It's very easy to make decisions about building in an area you don't live in.

Please put this letter with the hopefully large collection of objections and see that the council see it.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1121

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1163

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

According to the Environment Agency, the area that includes Grinstead Lane, Mash Barn and South Lancing is "at higher risk of flooding based on our records and predictions of likely flooding". This area extends to the River Adur. Grinstead Land and Manor Way were flooding at Christmas last, South Lancing is flooded at the moment (see youtube 'New flooding in Lancing West Beach 4 Nov 13'). So WHY is the much needed flood plain being built on? As for heavy constant traffic and pollution, Grinstead Lane is becoming unbearable - NO MORE TRAFFIC + POLLUTION!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 14

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I would like to register my opposition to the planned development of New Monks Farm, Lancing, cited within the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013 Part 2, section 5. I am a resident in Hayley Road, which is situated within the flood plain in North Lancing.

I object to the application due to the significantly increased level of flood risk which will be brought about by building on New Monks Farm. I also object due to the significantly increased level of traffic congestion that will occur on the A27.

New Monks Farm Objection:

New Monks Farm lies on a fragile flood plain which is interconnected to the residential areas within Lancing. Currently, as it is, it acts as a wetland retaining excess water – therefore helping protect local residential areas. The area is fragile and filled with many underground streams. If it were to be built upon and filled with concrete there would be a significant risk of ground and surface water displacement. This would lead to flooding not only of the new development, but also of the surrounding residential areas. It would affect thousands of peoples lives and their homes.

Flooding is very real in our area. Last Christmas we experienced significant flooding in the North and South sides of the flood plain. There were gardens and roads submerged in water, pumping lorries parked for weeks draining the water away, and water bubbling up out of the drains in Grinstead Lane. The sight of drainage lorries in Lancing became common place.

Unfortunately it is impossible to mitigate the flooding risks associated with the proposed New Monks Farm development. Lancing is at the foot of the Downs, the flood plain area is filled with underground streams, and is shallow with a 4ft drop across 2 miles. The water table just rises and rises in wet weather. Additionally, environmentalists forecast wetter more extreme weather conditions in future years. Filling the land with concrete will only lead to flooding, as the water will have nowhere to go.

Traffic Objection:

The A27 in rush hour is currently heavily congested, with long queues of traffic. On a typical week day it takes 10 minutes to get from Curvins Way onto the roadabout. Without rush hour traffic this would take minutes. On the return trip, again travelling from the bridge which runs over the River Adur to the roadabout takes 15 minutes. In non rush hour traffic this takes just a few minutes. The traffic is slow crawling at about 5mph, and the area heavily congested. To add to this traffic with a potential 600-1200 new cars (assuming every home owner has at least 1 car) would be lunacy.

Seven years ago a planning application was made for 100 homes. This was rejected by the Highways Agency as it was deemed that the A27 was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from these 100 homes. The same stretch of road is now being considered for additional traffic for 600 homes, a school and businesses. The region is in no way able to cope with this level of traffic.

In short I am very concerned regarding the impact this development will have on the local area in terms of significantly increased flood risk and traffic congestion.

For your interest please find below a map illustrating the underground rivers of Lancing – and the areas at risk of flooding which highlights the

fragility of the area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1136

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1068

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1123

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1124

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1125

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1126

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1127

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1128

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1129

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1130

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1131

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1132

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1133

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1152

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1135

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1120

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1137

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1138

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1139

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1140

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1141

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1142

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1143

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1144

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1145

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1146

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1147

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1148

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

After having a pump running permanently for 2 months through my property this year re. flooding, any further development on this area would be fatal!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1149

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1134

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 602

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1002

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

After last winter's experience over the dreadful local flooding it appears obvious that the proposed developments in the Draft Plan will only make matters worse.

The further concern remains the increase in the volume of traffic both in the Easterly and Westerly directions along the A27.

I would also like to comment on the adverse effect on the present wildlife and the further loss of 'green space' which at present breaks the ribbon of development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 611

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 610

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: West Street Sompting/Upper Brighton Road Worthing, and the intention to build 2 housing estates in Lancing and Sompting.

I live in West Street Sompting and have to deal with on a daily basis the stressful, time consuming and sometimes completely dangerous traffic jams that come about when people try to cut through the village from the A27.

Up until my daughter started school this September, travelling through my own road has just been a huge inconvenience, but now I have to walk her to and from school daily and it's treacherous.

We have to walk along a pavement that is sometimes inches thick and the traffic is literally almost touching you as it passes you. We have to keep crossing the road, as there is not a pavement that runs the length of one side of the road, sometimes the pavement disappears altogether.

We then choose to walk across a muddy field as one you come out of West Street and into Upper Brighton Road, there is no pavement at all for 180 metres.

What concerns me even more is that next year I will be doing this walk with a newborn baby. Some of the pavements are too slim to accommodate a pushchair, leaving no choice but to stick out into the road. I will also be unable to take the pushchair across the field that we use, so will have to walk along the pavement-less 180 metres of Upper Brighton Road. This fills me with absolute dread, as this road is a serious accident waiting to happen.

With the intention of building 2 housing estates nearby, this is only going to intensify an already enormous problem unless something is done to sort it out.

One of the best suggestions I have heard, is turning Church Lane into an exit only. This will stop all the hundreds of cars that shoot down it daily, and cut through Sompting Village in the attempt to save time from the Lyons Farm traffic lights.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 609

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

As a cyclist I find it quite dangerous already cycling through Sompting Village, despite having the right of way. If this new development goes ahead, I will just give up as 480+ cars will make it impossible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 608

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 607

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 606

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 605

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 53

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We write to strenuously object to the development proposals in the Lancing - Shoreham flood plain at New Monks Farm and the airport.

After the devastation of the last Christmas event which this area in North Lancing suffered, we cannot believe that Adur District Council can even think to propose their developments.

Do they not realise just how much we suffered for an 8 week period into the New Year because of the inability of this shallow plain to cope with the prolonged wet weather experienced during that period.

It was the worst experience of this sort of problem even seen for the 40 years we have lived here.

We had flood water up to within an inch of entering our bungalow. The front and rear gardens were 6" of water for many those weeks. We have two small dogs who could not be let out without carrying them out to higher dryer ground for fear that they may even drown!

We had tankers operating for 24 hours a day for nearly the 8 week period which made sleeping almost an impossibility - not to talk about loss of toilet facilities because of inundated sewers!

With all this, the council is still prepared to risk our well being by allowing such development. This is madness, bordering on neglect of the community it serves!

As for proposed roundabout on the A27 which, despite remedial drainage works running up to Christmas, after which this stretch of roads saw the worst flooding ever - this is absolutely nonsensical.

Residents like ourselves who rely upon the occasional break in the traffic caused by the Sussex Pad traffic lights will find it impossible to access the A27. A roundabout to the east of us will create a continual flow of traffic, particularly with the enormous increase of vehicles entering from the New Monks Farm and airport developments. This will cause a highly dangerous situation for all who live here along this over busy stretch which already has a high incidence of accidents.

How can Highways Agency be happy to allow this when they turned down a few years ago a proposed development on the same land because of the inability for the A27 to cope with the increased traffic from 100 homes - now it's 600 homes plus large business development areas!

We insist that the development areas, policies 5 & 7 be struck from the Adur Plan and that authority must strongly defend this decision to the government based upon maintaining the well being of all the residents who live around this sensitive flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 52

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We wish to object to the proposed development at New Monks Farm as part of the Adur Draft Plan. We feel extremely frustrated as one of the resident households affected by the serious flooding causing loss of gas supplies over Christmas 2012. This as we all know was caused by water pouring from the downs across A27 into Grinstead Lane, having nowhere to drain because of the already high water table level and blocked ditches, drains, and culverts.

The highways agency have since been trying to clear the culverts, drains and ditches to the surrounding A27 and Mash Barn areas but they are still silting up and pools of water remains along the A27 and Grinstead Lane when downfalls have occurred. The work that has been completed is still insufficient to handle the worst of the weather conditions.

Building 450/600 houses plus a school, plus 10,000 squares metres of business development will be a disaster and have a major impact on the already delicate floodplain, water levels and flow to the Shoreham sluice gates.

The current road structure in the area is stretched to the limit with high volumes of traffic using both the A27 and A259. With the closure of just one of these roads due to accidents, enormous traffic jams soon appear. Emergency services can just about cope now. This new development will make traffic volumes intolerable. It is possible these households could produce a further 1200 cars in the surrounding areas. There will be no escape from extra heavy traffic saturation. This is without the vast number of HGV's that will be in the area servicing the business development needs.

The new development accessing traffic onto the main A27 via roundabouts and slip roads will cause huge delays on the traffic flow on both sides of the A27. Further impact by the possible Morrisons supermarket development at the east end of Shoreham on the A259 expecting 2000 cars daily, will drastically reduce traffic flows through Shoreham high street and along the A259 to Lancing. Drivers will find rat runs through Shoreham to detour via the A27 to Worthing and beyond further increasing the volumes of traffic. We as residents cannot accept this situation, we live within 180 degree radius and there is no escape from this horrendous traffic onslaught.

ADUR DISTRICT COUNCIL, THIS IS NOT ROCKET SCIENCE...

DO NOT TURN LANCING INTO ANOTHER CHICHESTER WITH ALL THE ISSUES THAT SURROUND THIS AREA!

MORE HOUSES = MORE CONCRETE = MORE FLOODING

MORE HOUSES = MORE CARS = MORE TRAFFIC CHAOS

NO MORE HOUSES, NO MORE CARS = NO MORE MISERY

Adur District Council must take on board the full impact of this development on the local community and the effect on their quality of life.

Do the right thing and reject this development plan outright.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 604

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 589

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are writing to express our concerns to the proposed development to the land known as New Monks Farm site.

As you are aware, this area is prone to flooding, one cause being the 'run off' of rain water from the South Downs. The A27 only last month was awash with surface water, as the drainage system in place struggles to cope with the increased waste levels experienced in the last decade.

To build a development of this scale on this site will not only put them at risk to flooding, but will also have a 'knock on' affect to the surrounding area; not just from flooding, but with the overstretched resources of the town. An increase of traffic to the area on an already busy road can only add to the pollution and traffic chaos/build up with no other viable alternative. As with any project, the infrastructure and resources should be in place first, before such a large development is given consideration to avoid catastrophic problems at a later date.

Can the council and developers offer us all as residents guarantee that if the area floods, they will not only help with the clean up and repair costs, but also from the increase to insurance premiums which will undoubtedly follow.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 613

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

I would like to add to the above that when purchasing our property in 1959, we approached Worthing council to see what plans they had for the land to the rear of our garden - they categorically stated that no building would ever be built on that land as it was full of underground springs and waterlogged. Lots of problems would arise if houses were now built there - for the builders and buyers (if any?!)

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 590

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 579

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: New Monks Farm development proposal.

This area is part of the flood plain and should remain as such.. There are already problems with local flooding.

Extra traffic will exacerbate current congestion on the A27.

Empty properties should be fully utilised before any more are built.

The strategic gap should be retained especially as the area is identified as a water stress area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 990

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I object due to extra traffic and ruining a beautiful village with all the extra traffic. I suggest you invest this money into protecting the environment we have i.e. a bypass around Worthing for the traffic etc. We already have a water shortage and the drains currently cannot support more homes. I think you must be mad in Adur Council.

WE NEED A BYPASS NOT EXTRA HOMES.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1070

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE LIB DEM PARTY (Jemima Bland petition)

KEEP THE GAP ON THE MAP!

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm.

We, the undersigned, are opposed to any further house building in the strategic "green gap" between Lancing and Shoreham.

We believe that any further development will add significantly to the risk of flooding, damage a fragile environment, and overload existing transport and other infrastructure services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 992

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

We still have the fear of flooding. More traffic will cause more problems on the A27 and surrounding roads (there is enough problems when there are road accidents). What do we want more business developments for when there are empty units all around Adur standing empty. More housing will bring more traffic - will the housing be for local people or not for foreigners. When are we going to get the much needed bypass for the A27.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1061

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Liberal Democrats

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am strongly opposed to this development for the reasons set out by local residents' associations. Separately, as part of the consultation exercise, I shall be submitting a petition signed by several hundred people opposing development at New Monks Farm.  
I would also point out that proposed development at New Monks Farm seems to be in conflict with Revised Draft Policy 36 (pages 141-142) on flood risk and sustainable drainage. There is nothing in the current Plan document to suggest that flooding and drainage problems at New Monks Farm and in the Mash Barn area can be adequately mitigated.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 993

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The proposed development for up to 600 homes in New Monks Farm and the Sompting Gap are far too large for the present infrastructure of the area. A27/A259 are already girdlocked at peak times, and a further 1,000 homes in this area would add approx 1500 cars to these roads. Lancing Railway station, a very busy station on the coastway would need to see more trains and a longer station to cope with bigger trains. Environment issues such as water supply and the fact that both these areas are prone to flooding. I feel this would be a massive mistake to even think of development of this size.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 994

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

No more building sites of over 10 houses should be built unless we have a better A27. This road was going to be made into a dual carriageway over 40 years ago. Most of the time its gridlocked unable to take more cars from new housing. All MPs in West Sussex should be bringing it up to transport minister each week. If there is an accident on A27 or A259 sea road we are unable to move because we are in between the sea and downs. And what a mess up they have done at Grove Lodge for the new college and housing estate. And houses should not be built where there is flooding. If they can spend money H S 2 train way for a few thousand a better A27 will help many more thousands at less cost. At the beginning of the year we had a funeral to go to at Findon (3-4 miles) and took over 50 minutes to get there, but we were late because of the traffic. The schools, doctors and other services are unable to take it. We need to keep the gap green.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 996

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

We would like to keep the gap! How on earth can that amount of houses be built on a flood plain, we have a flood down the side of our bungalow every time it rains. Building more houses won't help the situation. It's a flood plain which we didn't know we when we bought the property 20 years ago, as other neighbours didn't know either. How about ditches being cleared, that will be another thing to worry about. The A27 has enough traffic to deal with, its absolutely nonstop.  
Sincerely hope this project doesn't happen.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 997

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Monks Farm is on the flood plain. If houses are built here it will mean a large part of Lancing will have flooding, the repeat of last Christmas more often! I have lived in my house for 35 years and that was the worst flooding I have seen. Also, the A27 can not take any more traffic. Instead of building the Monks Farm and joining so called golf course, need more land drainage.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 998

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Living next door to Brighton and Hove training ground which needs to be well drained where does all the ground water go and now to suggest building 450+ houses in the same area with concrete and tarmac this could well put my house and road into a flood area. The traffic problem on the A27 and surrounding roads will get considerably worse. These plans need to be seriously reconsidered.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 999

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

It would be a very unhealthy choice to do any type of development on this site, because the land lays in a natural water basin, collecting rain water spilled down from the Downs. And as the land is always waterlogged, the overspill of any excess rain water can only raise the water bed level! To try to develop on this land would be a losing battle and would be best left to nature to enjoy!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1000

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

It's a flood plain, why would you put more houses on it. Just look at Manor Close and surrounding roads. You can't cope now, how are you going to manage with 600 houses, and its not just houses you have now added business developments and schools. It should stay as a flood plain with ditches cleared every year or two and more if necessary.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1001

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I live in Grinstead Lane. Last Christmas we had no gas on Christmas day due to flooding in the road. For several weeks later due to the high water table water kept getting into the gas pipe which caused a lot of problems with our heating system. I strongly object to the building on a natural flood plain which will impact on everyone living in this area.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 603

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 524

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

We are writing to you in response to the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013, following the Public Meeting in Lancing Parish Hall on 31 October 2013 to say we wish to object to the proposal to build 450-600 houses, business developments, a new school and roundabouts on the New Monks Farm site/A27.

We would like the following comments to be noted that:

- 53% of Adur is within the new South Downs National Park and so cannot be built on - leaving on 47% for everything else.
- We are further constrained by the sea as well as the Downs - there is nowhere else to go!
- Last winter, the houses in Manor Way and Manor Close were flooded with sewage and without gas/electricity etc for weeks over the Christmas period.
- A new primary school is planned too for this site - which will generate extra traffic/doctors/dentists etc, putting great strain on the already over-burdened infrastructure and civic amenities.
- The A27 floods frequently - disastrously so a few years ago when the whole area was completely cut off for weeks.
- At least one, if not two, roundabouts are planned for the A27 we hear - where is all this extra traffic going to go? Can you imagine the traffic jams at peak times all trying to negotiate several more roundabouts? It is bad enough now!
- There would seem to be plenty of housing available and new sites of 1, 2 4 and more houses are being built all over the Lancing area.
- What has happened to keeping green spaces? This plan would develop one of the remaining green spaces between Lancing and the River Adur/Shoreham.

We do hope this Adur Plan is not already a fait-a-complis and that you will take note of the very many residents who have taken the time and trouble to tell you of their views and their fears.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 510

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

New Monks Farm, Lancing

I raise objections to the development at the New Monks Farm site on the following grounds:

- Congestion of A27. The information provided as to necessary improvements that would be required is too vague and as a result I have no confidence that the issue would be adequately resolved given the extreme traffic congestion in this area already. Specific information would need to be provided to allow the public to properly assess this. However based on my reading of the plan, it appears clear that these 'intended' measures would only feed into this area of congestion and make worse not only by volume of traffic but by the introduction of another roundabout. I use the A27 (entering via Grinstead Lane) daily during the rush hour to and from work. This route already has an extremely unacceptable amount of congestion. The only reasonable proposal that would address this issue satisfactorily would be for a bypass to be put in place for Lancing and Worthing. Any suggestions that other measures would address the traffic congestion in this area are farcical.
  - Flood Risks. The information with regard to this is extremely vague and gives no information as to how the flood risks would be mitigated for both the development and surrounding areas. On the information provided there can be no confidence that this can be adequately dealt with.
  - Demands on local services. The report indicates that a Primary School would be built but gives no information as to what would be put in place to address the demands on doctor surgeries, hospital and emergency services.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 511

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 512

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Traffic congestion

We do not feel that the information given for necessary improvements is detailed enough and do not feel confident that this will be sufficient to solve the problems in an area that is already very congested. In fact we can only see traffic problems getting worse than they are now on the A27 and surrounding roads.

With too many developments promises are made at this stage that all traffic problems will be resolved, only later do we find once the development is completed that so called improvements of traffic congestion is wholly inadequate and traffic is more congested than previously. The traffic improvements should be carried out first and only when this is satisfactory should the development be given the go ahead.

#### Flood risk

We feel that in an area that is very prone to flooding that this development will make it worse and even if the planners manage to avoid the area of this development flooding, surrounding areas will be suffering more from flooding than they do at the moment including housing and Shoreham Airport. This water needs to go somewhere and there are no details in the report that we can see that says how this will be dealt with. Simply saying that the developers will have to deal with this is not good enough!

#### Local services

We see that a new primary school is going to be built, however this development will put a further strain on other already stretched local services such as doctors surgeries, hospital services, police services (we do not really have a local police station any more), public transport, social services and child care services. This all needs to be addressed before the plan is approved.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Paragraphs 2.54 – 2.64 of the Revised Draft Local Plan identify a number of significant environmental and infrastructure constraints to the development of land at New Monks Farm. In summary:

- Agricultural land quality: land to the west of Mash Barn Lane is Grade 2.
- Landscape impact: 'Mash Barn Lane is identified in the Landscape and Ecological Survey of Key Sites Within Adur as a "natural landscape edge" and the fields to the east of this lane form part of the central landscape of the Gap and make an important contribution to its sense of openness and "greenness"' (paragraph 2.55).
- Biodiversity impact: 'The most important biodiversity habitats on the site, as identified by the Landscape and Ecological Survey, are the network of streams and ditches which flow eastwards through the small pastures to the north west of the site and along Mash Barn Lane' (paragraph 2.56).
- Access: either direct on the already heavily congested A27, via a new roundabout, or through existing residential areas (paragraph 2.57-2.60).
- Flooding: 'The site is predominantly located in flood zone 3a (high probability).....Parts of the site are at risk from surface water flooding, particularly the northern section, and the site is also susceptible to ground water flooding' (paragraph 2.61).
- Noise: the site is close to Shoreham Airport and the northern part of the site is adjacent to the A27.

Agricultural Land Quality: the National Planning Policy Framework states that 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality' (paragraph 112). (The Glossary in Annex 2 defines the "best and most versatile agricultural land" as land within grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification). The development of the higher quality land to the west of Mash Barn Lane as proposed in the Revised Draft Local Plan is therefore clearly contrary to the NPPF.

Landscape impact: CPRE Sussex notes the conclusion of the Landscape and Ecological Survey of Key Sites Within Adur that this part of the Lancing-Shoreham Local Green Gap has 'relatively low landscape sensitivity'. However, we consider that this underplays both the significance of this gap between the two settlements and the role it plays in maintaining the separate identities of the settlements, and its contribution to the setting of Lancing.

The West Sussex Land Management Guidelines for the Worthing and Adur Fringes identifies 'urban development pressures, especially in the gaps between settlements' and 'closing of open views between settlements' as key sensitivities of this character area. The Lancing-Shoreham Gap is especially significant because it represents a sweep of landscape from the South Downs virtually to the coast without any substantial coastal urban development, and its integrity has already been harmed by the Brighton and Hove Albion FC training facility.

Given the landscape importance and sensitivity of the land to the east of Mash Barn Lane as recognised in the Survey, it is simply not credible that development here as proposed, however sensitive the design, would not have a substantial impact on the character of the Gap and the physical and perceptual separation of Lancing and Shoreham. "Strategically sited areas of woodland" to the east of the site to provide a distinctive "green edge" would themselves detract from the openness of the Gap.

Biodiversity impact: a large number of species use these natural green space areas and drainage ditches as their habitat: deer, bats, badgers,

foxes, numerous invertebrates, water voles, crested newts, slow worms, grass snakes and many species of birds, including lapwings. Many of these forage or otherwise move around the whole undeveloped area, which has already recently been diminished by the Brighton and Hove Albion FC training facility. Therefore, CPRE Sussex believes that, notwithstanding the requirements of Revised Draft Policy 5 for ecological enhancements in the north-west corner of the site and the retention and enhancement of the existing network of water bodies on site, the development of 450-600 homes on this site would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity.

Access: the A27 is already at overcapacity and yet the Plan proposes access direct from the proposed developments at New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport on to it. The introduction of a new roundabout along this section would be an obstacle to existing traffic flows, both through traffic and local traffic. The resulting further congestion would not improve local residents' quality of life nor enhance the economic attractiveness of Adur for new businesses.

Flooding: paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework states 'Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.' The Revised Draft Local Plan recognises the high vulnerability of the majority of the site to flooding but, importantly, this is not a hypothetical situation – the "risk" is a reality, as evidenced by the flooding emergency experienced by local residents over Christmas/New Year 2012/13.

Also significant is that flooding is not constrained to the proposed development area: whatever is developed in the north of the Lancing-Shoreham Gap will impact the drainage for the whole flood plain area – upstream and downstream, particularly West Beach, which will be at further risk of flooding from displaced surface water. CPRE Sussex therefore considers that development at New Monks Farm would not achieve clause V9 of the Vision – that 'flood risk will have been greatly reduced through..... the careful consideration of the location of new development' – and would be contrary to paragraph 100 of the Framework.

The Sustainability Appraisal notes the potential for conflict with a number of objectives including biodiversity, historic environment, countryside, pollution and flood risk. The policy requirements may "mitigate" these conflicts, but will not overcome them entirely. Given this extensive range of significant environmental and infrastructure impacts, CPRE Sussex does not see how development at New Monks Farm can possibly be considered to be "sustainable", given the National Planning Policy Framework's explanation 'to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously' (paragraph 8) and 'Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life' (paragraph 9). Furthermore, the allocation of this site is contrary to one of the Framework's 12 Core Planning Principles set out in paragraph 17 that 'Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework'. CPRE Sussex therefore objects to Revised Draft Policy 5.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 985

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Apollo Aviation Advisory Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing both as a resident of North Lancing and as an existing business based at Shoreham Airport.

Objections to the draft local plan on grounds which apply equally to Draft Policy 4, 5 and 7 are:

a) The Adur District is constrained physically by the South Downs National Park to the North and the Sea to the South. The A27 and the A259 are already heavily congested at certain times. The congestion on the A27 west bound starts at the North Lancing Roundabout but the root of the cause is further West as traffic has to negotiate the Hill Barn cross roads, Lyons Farm traffic lights, the A27 capacity halving to a single carriageway (in effect until west of Worthing) and the Grove Lodge roundabout. The reverse applies eastbound. It is hard to see how this situation can be changed without building a by-pass in the National Park, an obviously remote outcome. Unless land is reclaimed from the sea, an even more unlikely prospect, there appears to be little possibility of significantly improving the A259. The proposed new roundabout, wherever situated, may provide better and safer access to the proposed developments, but will only add to the traffic on the A27 and potentially slow down the flow of cross traffic. Therefore:

i) The proposed developments will lead to totally unacceptable levels of traffic on the A27 making the area less attractive to both residents and businesses;

ii) The proposed developments would lead to increased pollution and damage to the environment caused by the exhausts of queuing traffic.

B) Both developments lead to an erosion of the Green Gap between Shoreham and Lancing leading to a further loss of the attractiveness of Adur to existing and potential residents.

C) Both proposed developments are in flood zones, not all tidal, which unless carefully managed will cause flooding to existing properties. As has already been demonstrated on a number of occasions recently to the discomfort of residents.

2. Objections to Draft Policy 5 are:

a. Shoreham Airport protects the Green Gap between Shoreham and Lancing. The proposed development at New Monks Farm may well lead to future calls for the closure of the Airport leading to further calls for the development of the whole Airport site other than as an Airfield.

i) The Albemarle Shoreham (Brighton City) Airport Noise Action Plan 2012 takes no account of the helicopter circuit to the west of runway 02/20 (copy attached). It will be seen that this takes helicopters over the New Monks Farm development at a height of 600 ft. compared with the fixed wing aircraft circuit pattern which is flown at 1100 ft. Whatever noise mitigation measures are taken there will be complaints about noise which could lead to the closure of the helicopter circuit and the consequent loss of revenue to the Airport Operating Company making it even less viable.

li) At any major airport, areas close to the take-off or landing paths would be safeguarded. In the case of smaller airfields it is the Airport Operator's responsibility to ensure that proper safeguarding is maintained. Below are the comments that I made regarding the football academy:

"It is Her Majesty's Government advice that all aerodromes should be safeguarded." Please refer to the Department of Transport circular of 4 November 2005. Safeguarding aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas. Publisher: Department for Transport Publication type: Circular Published date: 4 November 2005. Mode/topic: Aviation, Air Traffic, Security and resilience. The UK Civil aviation Authority have also published a document - 'Safeguarding of Aerodromes - CAP738'. Chapter 1 paragraph 1.2 is of particular relevance. "Other aerodromes are

safeguarded by privately agreed consultation with the LPA. This is called 'unofficial' safeguarding and is not obligatory under Statutory Direction; however, it is the published advice of Her Majesty's Government that all aerodromes should be safeguarded". As the proposed development should not be permitted until the requirements for aerodrome safeguarding are fully considered and taken into account."

I am also attaching a copy of the verbal submissions that I made at the planning hearing relating to the football academy.

These comments apply equally to the New Monks Farm development.

It is worrying that the Airport Operators do not appear to be voicing similar concerns given their responsibilities as outlined above.

Uncontrolled development surrounding the Airport that does not take into account safeguarding will ultimately lead to calls for closure of the Airfield.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.02

Specific objections in relation to the Strategic Site Allocations of New Monks Farm

A) The site lies within the Local Green Gap between Lancing and Shoreham and west of the River Adur. Future development of this site on the scale proposed would have an adverse impact on the purpose of the gap, which is to maintain openness and avoid coalescence of the settlements of Shoreham and Lancing, as set out in Revised Draft Policy 2 & 13. The Revised DLP sets out to protect the open areas between settlements as part of its Vision and Objectives, but contradicts itself by its proposal to allocate this site, which would narrow the gap significantly. The Revised DLP (paragraph 2.55) recognises the sensitivity of this site and states that 'Mash Barn Lane is a natural landscape 'edge' and that the fields to the east of this lane form part of the central landscape of the Gap and make an important contribution to its sense of openness and 'greenness'.'

B) The majority of the site is Grade 1 agricultural land. Allocation of this land for development is inconsistent with NPPF Chapter 11, 'Conserving and enhancing the natural environment' (paragraphs 109, 110 and 112). Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality. Furthermore, plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value and protect valued landscapes and soils. The Revised DLP recognises that Revised Draft Policy 5 (Allocation of land at New Monks Farm), '[has] some potential for conflict with a number of environmental objectives regarding biodiversity, historic environment, countryside, pollution and flood risk' (paragraph 2.66 P.40).

C) Access to the site will require major road improvements including a new roundabout at the Sussex Pad and link road to the site along the northern border of the green gap. The requirements for such major infrastructure further constrain this site.

D) The site predominantly lies within Flood Zone 3a (high probability), the same category as the Steyning Road site.

E) The northern part of this site is located adjacent to the noisy A27 trunk road. The Revised DLP states that a noise assessment and appropriate mitigation may be required. Yet the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Steyning Road site states that the proximity of the A27 is a reason for excluding it from housing allocation, even though the noise will not impact the site to the same extent as at New Monks Farm because of the road's elevation.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Strategic Site Allocation (Revised Draft Policy 2, 4, 5)

The Strategic Land Allocation within the Revised DLP should be amended, as follows:-

The Shoreham Airport site should be removed from the strategic land allocation for employment or significantly reduced and re-orientated so that it is on the south side of the airfield, amongst the existing light industrial buildings and screened by the railway embankment to the south.

The New Monks Farm site should be restricted to development east of Mash Barn Lane only. The L&ES states that 'The fields between the edge of the built-up area of Lancing and Mash Barn Lane contribute little to the landscape setting of Lancing or the integrity of landscapes within the Strategic Gap' but the study goes on to describe Mash Barn Lane as a 'natural landscape edge' and that the fields to the east of this lane form part of the central landscape of the Gap and make an important contribution to its sense of openness and 'greenness'.

The Steyning Road site should be included within the strategic land allocation for housing and employment use as it is already less constrained and more readily developable than other sites already included in the Revised DLP.

The Revised DLP should be amended to include a policy requiring the District to safeguard all potential available sites for future development use, given the constraints identified by the sea and the National Park on the District as a whole.

A general emphasis should be placed within the Revised DLP on using more infill or back garden sites and on redeveloping existing sites with either greater density or taller buildings for housing and employment, which is the only long term sustainable solution given the constraints of the District.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 673

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Lancing is so grid-locked with traffic on A27, sometimes we wait 10 minutes to get onto the A27 from Manor Road. Our infrastructure will not take more people needing medical care, schools, council services. Our area is under great pressure. The flood plain is no place to build houses!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 672

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The A27 is now at a standstill everyday for most of the day. The proposed plan will cause many more vehicles to need to use already saturated roads. A new round-a-bout will not solve this.

- 1) Both of the proposed development areas in Sompting will cause more traffic on already saturated roads.
  - 2) The local environment will be affected in a detrimental manner, both for the current residents and the wild life.
  - 3) The current infrastructure will not support the proposed development and the plan does not suggest improvements that will support the proposed plan.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 76

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

North Lancing should not be "Developed" any more.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 987

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Natural England

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It is welcomed that further evidence is being gathered around the potential landscape and biodiversity impacts of the new access and roundabouts which would be needed for the New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport developments to go ahead.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 669

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I don't want anymore buildings going up. There has been constant building work and I am fed up.

I object to all of the plans. Use the empty homes and offices and convert them. Surely it would be cheaper?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 580

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: New Monks Farm Proposals.

1. South East England suffers 'water stress' according to DEFRA and any housing/commercial development can only make this worse.
  2. DEFRA has designated the proposed development area a high flood probability zone. Land surrounding the Adur estuary is well known as a flood plain so any development would be unwise.
  3. The A27 already suffers severe congestion at peak times. This will soon become worse when the BHA Training facility is opened. A large housing development is likely to lead to further 1000 or so cars per day using an already overcrowded road. This is clearly unacceptable.
  4. Atmospheric pollution will be increased as traffic congestion increases.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 73

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 995

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The whole plan drawn up by the Conservative Council is totally unrealistic and hugely detrimental to the surrounding area.

- Massive flood risk. Already had flooded homes last year and sewage spills.
- A27 already congested and in total gridlock when frequent accidents occur.
- Lack of doctors/hospital beds/ public services.
- Poor bus routes.
- Overdevelopment into green spaces, loss of further wildlife habitats.

Following the BHAFC development on green space, a huge mistake setting a proposal to further mass development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Strategic Allocations

The County Council is supportive of the approach to provision of education infrastructure for the strategic sites outlined in the revised draft Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). A site for a 1form of entry (fe) school with the possibility to expand to 2fe is required. This is based on a consideration of the strategic sites and allocation for smaller developments within the built up area of Adur. This new primary school would be most suitably located at the New Monks Farm site, therefore land for a new primary school site will be required as part of the New Monks Farm development for both the lower and upper levels of development proposed. The schools in Lancing are all quite full and the majority are already at three forms of entry (fe). If the County Council was to continue expanding the schools, this would not comply with County policy of no more than 3fe. As outlined in the draft IDP, a further primary school site may be required as part of the Shoreham Harbour strategic allocation. This will depend on the capacity available to expand existing schools in the local area.

Revised draft policies 5, 6, & 7: Where the policies refer to 'assessments' and 'an assessment of archaeological assets (sampled by field evaluation)...' etc. Please refer to NPPF paragraph 128 which states that LPAs 'should require developers to submit a desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.' Desk based assessment (DBA), based on information obtained from the HER is a sensible starting point for major schemes and is worth including in the wording of the policy. A field evaluation (essentially a trial trenching exercise) is the most cost effective way to manage risk by quantifying whether mitigation measures will be required for proposal sites with unknown archaeological potential and establishing what level of resource will be needed. DBA and field evaluation for major schemes should be considered at the pre-application stage, not just the planning application stage to allow the results of the assessment and evaluation to be considered in good time at the determination stage.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 72

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 526

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The flood plain adjacent to a tidal river and airport requires serious geological expert investigation. I would suggest a Dutch consultancy firm provides a report before any building work is undertaken. Clearly the sluices and ditches are totally inadequate for the current inflow from the north and only huge water pumps installed in purpose built canals can shift these amounts of water.

In England, this was carried out in the 16-17th Century to reclaim large land areas in Norfolk and around the Wash.

There are websites for dutch firms who use their expertise gained from many years in Holland to demonstrate their abilities.

A number of natural springs flow under this plain towards the sea. A first class example in this area is the spring at Fulking, which has flowed since the 1930s and probably before that without cease into the roadside there.

Who pays? A combination of Government and potential developers with a small cost to Adur and West Sussex should cover a professional survey. Any other work could prove to be prohibitive.

That is my contribution and I hope it may prove useful to solve our number one priority in Lancing, for the residents who have suffered CONTINUOUS flooding and damage over many years. It seems that they are now being inflicted with higher insurance premiums, as the area is known by property insurance companies. Many are elderly residents and can barely afford the huge costs.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

New Monks Farm, Lancing

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Update (produced in 2012) does not adequately demonstrate that current risk can be technically or practically mitigated to the level of detail required (as set out in paragraph 8 of Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework). It is agreed that a site specific flood risk assessment should be carried out by any developers of the site at application stage and this would set out in detail how the flood risk on the sites would be mitigated for and how recommendations of the SFRA will be implemented. However, following the NPPF Guidance the Exception Test should also be met at the Local Plan stage. Adur District Council should satisfy itself that sufficient evidence has been submitted at this stage that demonstrates that the issues covered by Part 2 of the test can be overcome, according to paragraph 102 of the NPPF.

It is recommended that Adur District Council should ensure that it is satisfied that flood risk mitigation measures at sites in the highest levels of flood risk (3a, groundwater, sewer and surface water) are practicable and achievable for current and future flood risk to the sites and produce no adverse effects to adjacent areas. It is suggested that this work could be helped by the production of the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for the area (to be led by WSCC and due in 2014) and the outputs of the existing Southern Water Services infiltration study to provide greater understanding of the combined effects of surface water and other flood risks.

The site needs to link in with the existing and aspirational cycle network in West Sussex (e.g. Old Shoreham Tollbridge and NCN2) as well as access across the A27 to the South Downs National Park. Whilst there is a no comprehensive aspirational cycle network currently, this is being developed in Adur through the Shoreham Harbour Transport Strategy (for Shoreham) and local engagement (e.g. for Lancing).

Consideration should also be given to the inclusion of appropriate non-motorised user access / connections to Lancing and to the rail station.

Revised Draft Policy 5: This policy should seek to ensure that existing surface water and groundwater flow paths on site are retained or are adequately diverted to, so that the current levels of risk both on site and in upstream and downstream areas are not increased.

It is welcomed that Revised Draft Policy 5 indicates that flood risk elsewhere should be improved by development in this area where possible, as there are currently residential properties that suffer from surface water, sewer and groundwater flooding in the New Monks Farm area due to the hydrology, geology and topography of the area.

The creation of a Country Park and informal recreation (approx. 28 hectares), as part of a Landscape Strategy / Green infrastructure strategy is to be welcomed. This will need detailed planning to ensure that it delivers multiple benefits, including biodiversity. The importance of the network of streams and ditches has been highlighted in Section 2.56.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 71

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 527

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My husband and I live in an extremely busy road, which as is the case, got much worse in the last 20 years. Please, please do not consider building housing and extras in the Shoreham Airport area. We have suffered with sewage overflowing, constant traffic outside our house and on the A27. We fear that the extra traffic that would arise would be unacceptable. This is already quite a built up area. Although we are somewhat 'connected' by the Downs on the north of the A27, that doesn't mean that housing has to be 'squashed' along the south side of the A27/ The fear of constant flooding to the East of us, is unacceptable and fears that this would become much worse if this development takes place.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 657

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: KEEP GAPS ON THE MAP.

Please help keep the 'gaps on the map' by stopping flood risk development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

We understand that planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area and stopped circulation of traffic; at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The 'Gaps' are important to wild life as well as to our quality of life and they are being eroded away. 'Action plans' are not enough. This development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is, yet alone with the potential of an extra 1000 cars pouring on to it!

The Sussex resevoirs were almost dry a short time ago, so how can the water company cope with more than 1000 extra people requiring water supply and sewage disposal.

What, if any, plans are there to cope with the need for extra schools, nurseries, work, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc? The whole infrastructure is effectively creaking at the seams already so please, how is it expected to cope with more people?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 70

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 561

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at a great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago, so how can the water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal; not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 68

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I do not think the proposed new roundabout on the A27 will solve the increased traffic problems: most households own at least 1 car. I do not believe the flooding issue will be solved, neither can I believe children will cycle or walk to Middle/Secondary schools, or adults for work place. I think extra children could result in large class numbers, there are not the shops, doctor surgeries to support such large development. Mostly I object to any increased traffic on the A27! Does this housing development mean we are no longer a village and not have to pay extra Parish Council Tax!? I have studied the proposal for West Sompting and once again feel this is bad idea, any traffic problems on the A27 already mean vehicles using narrow West Street, any increased traffic, which there will be. Will put even more pressure on surrounding roads and A27. There are not the shops, surgeries and schools to support any more housing development and even more pressure will be put on the A27 especially at Lyons Way traffic light.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 67

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Building 600 homes on New Monks Farm site with a school, community centre and 1000 sq. metres of business development on Lancing/Worthing strategic gap is excessive. The BHA complex is being built now and this enough for the area. It is unreasonable to expect local residents to accept any more building development. Another area should be chosen to take some of the additional building.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 578

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I wish to object strongly to the proposed development of six hundred new houses at New Monks Farm, Lancing (Policy 5, Map 4 in the draft local plan).

I have lived in Grinstead Lane for twenty three years and in this time have seen a huge increase in the volume of traffic. During rush hour the cars are queuing a few hundred yards from the roundabout to join the A27. The trunk road cannot cope with the volume of traffic now, so the situation will be much worse with a minimum of six hundred (more likely to be a thousand) extra cars on the road at peak times.

There were serious problems on the A27 last year as the drainage system is unable to cope with the amount of water coming off the downs. Despite major works being carried out at the time, the water still does not drain away properly. The Environment Agency website shows the New Monks Farm area is extremely likely to be flooded by the River Adur.

Grinstead Lane has been subject to flooding for many years. In previous years, we have had tankers outside twenty four hours a day to cope with the water when the weather is bad. Last Christmas, the water level was so high that it was coming up the driveway, not to mention the burst gas main because the water was unable to drain away or be removed quickly enough by the tankers. My insurance premiums are already raised as the Environment Agency considers this to be a flood risk area. Bear in mind, this is happening with a flood plain in place. What will happen if this development is allowed to go ahead and there is no longer a flood plain. It is there for a reason.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 74

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1035

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Our concern is the infrastructure cannot tolerate the increase in traffic and feel that a relief road or bypass of the A27 is needed, to allow these developments to be accessed and viable. Delays and congestion with traffic at the present time make Sompting almost inaccessible at peak times.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 601

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 34

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The flood plain is a natural phenomena designed to store excessive water from precipitation and groundwater. The proposed builds at the Airport and New Monks Farm and the current development including the thousands of tonnes of aggregate on the alleged golf course reduces the capacity of the flood plain by a third.

The development is within flood zone 3. The consequences will be devastating floods for houses within and surrounding the flood plain.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH NO MORE DEVELOPMENT ON THE FLOOD PLAIN. COMMON SENSE MUST PREVAIL.

EMAIL (LATE REP):

Please find aerial photograph taken Friday last week.

50% of the flood plain has been severely compromised by BHAFC and the golf course dumping.

There is no evidence of the thirteen attenuation ponds on the golf course that were required by the EA to offset flooding risk for third parties.

Note the flooding of the pitches nearest the railway line at BHAFC, the water is moving south relentlessly also the disruption to the surface water and groundwater flows is obvious at West Beach.

If NMF build goes ahead it will create catastrophic flooding.

We at West Beach consider the fragile balance of the flood plain has been seriously compromised and we are extremely concerned based upon the recent flooding event, about the ability of the flood plain to protect our properties during the forthcoming and subsequent winters.

BHAFC must reconsider their drainage strategy and the golf course must adhere to the planning permission regulations in the hope that flooding risk can be reduced.

The NMF build must not go ahead.

We urge you to revisit the environmental impact surveys because we are now experiencing unforeseen/unprecedented circumstances.

We also request our attendance at the government inspectors appraisal to submit further photographic evidence against the build on New Monks Farm.

Another Email Rep:

We at West Beach and Willow Brook farm representing 600 households and 2000 residents robustly and totally support the content of Bill Freeman's submission as secretary to Lancing Manor residents network .

We at West Beach are already suffering the worst flooding ever experienced, we are certain given the volume and spread of water that this is a dramatic result of massive interference with the flood plain by BHAFC, Golf Course and improved drainage systems from the A27 and water courses in the North of the flood plain .

BHAFC have yet to construct 5 all weather pitches which require enormous excavation and are the equivalent of 5 football pitch sized slabs of concrete on the already severely damaged natural flood plain together with the continued dumping of land fill aggregate on the golf course West Beach and surrounding areas will flood catastrophically .

SUDS have proven time and again across the country to be utterly inadequate in terms of severe precipitation and especially groundwater flooding , the displacement potential is enormous .

The proposal to build a further 600 houses is sheer lunacy given the current flooding events already being experienced .  
Lancing flood plain has lost a third of its flood protective capacity any more loss and the damage to residents properties will be even more catastrophic .  
West Beach Residents Association also formally requests to appear before the Inspector at the examination of the Adur plan to register our already well documented objections

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 36

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Regarding the proposed building of 1000 or more new houses in the Sompting and Lancing area.

Apart from the obvious problems of buildings on flood plains in Lancing the additional traffic into Grinstead and the roundabout to the A27, which is already a real problem will magnify. The queues of cars from Worthing and Brighton are continuous, trying to join this junction from North or South at the moment is hazardous and will of-course become even worse when the footballs cars join the queue.

The proposed houses on green fields in Sompting would create an even bigger problem with traffic in West Street and the ( already notorious ) hold - ups on the A27. This lane is already a well known rat run from the main road. What happened to the long ago proposed road into East Worthing?

Over 1000 new houses, with lots of families having two - or - more cars will mean the worst part of 2000 cars choking our roads.

Please oppose this madness.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 37

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the proposed of between 400 - 600 new houses and industrial units in the area for the following reasons: -

The increased volume in traffic on the A27 would be totally unacceptable as additional round about etc. would not solve the problems that already exist, let alone the huge increase in traffic that would result from the proposed buildings.

There is already a serious bottle - neck at the LYONS FARM traffic lights and without Anew road to take traffic right from the existing A27 this whole stretch of road is - and will be - an escalating NIGHTMARE!

The roundabout at the MANOR LEISURE CENTRE is cause for death waiting to happen and should have TRAFFIC LIGHTS - NOW - and certainly if any of this new plan goes ahead.

There are very few green sites left along this part of the South Coast and I think that this area should be used for recreational purposes.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 38

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the proposed of between 400 - 600 new houses and industrial units in the area for the following reasons: -

The increased volume in traffic on the A27 would be totally unacceptable as additional round about etc. would not solve the problems that already exist, let alone the huge increase in traffic that would result from the proposed buildings.

There is already a serious bottle - neck at the LYONS FARM traffic lights and without a new road to take traffic right from the existing A27 this whole stretch of road is - and will be - an escalating NIGHTMARE!

The roundabout at the MANOR LEISURE CENTRE is cause for death waiting to happen and should have TRAFFIC LIGHTS - NOW - and certainly if any of this new plan goes ahead.

There are very few green sites left along this part of the South Coast and I think that this area should be used for recreational purposes.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1027

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

Although I am not in the immediately affected part of Lancing, living near Beach Green, this development appears to me to be wholly unsuitable for the green space that is currently there. I have been following reports of flooding in the area immediately to the South of proposed development area 3, and believe that any further development here will tend to increase this problem after heavy rain. If the water already has nowhere to go, then concreting over even more open space does not seem to be a good idea at all.

I can foresee a situation where the residents of roads such as Boundary Road/Wide Way will be unable to insure their properties against flooding. Regarding development area 1, the loss of green space doesn't seem to be a major concern to government planners, but if one looks at Google Maps there is already a ribbon of developed land from Brighton to Bognor with precious few open spaces between them; this would be one of the few left to disappear. On the map this appears to be a substantial area, so would inevitably involve a large increase in traffic along a section of the A27 that moves a little more than walking pace for some of the day already. If this area too is already designated as a high probability flood zone (I drove through standing water several times last year on the A27 after not exceptional rainfall), then it seems madness to continue to build on land that if nothing else acts a valuable and important soakaway for the surrounding area.

I am aware that my comments are largely negative with regard to this proposal; however I see few if any positives in any development at all on these areas of land, given the importance they already have in their present state to existing development all around them.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 41

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It seems to me that there is too much pressure to push developments through in the name of progress. Regarding the consultation on housing sited on the flood plain in Lancing, it can not be a sensible thing to do. If the development behind the West Beach estate was successfully avoided, surely the development on the land between the Brighton and Hove training ground and A27 should be, for the same reasons? The flood plain has a purpose, if it is restricted, the excess water will seek other ways to dissipate. We have yet to discover if the Brighton and Hove training ground leads to any flooding problems.

I have lived on the mash barn estate for more than forty years and have not yet suffered from flooding - the local flooding last winter was not far from my home. There would be a greatly increased prospects that will change if the proposed 600 houses are built. It will also exacerbate the problems endured by those living along A27, between Lancing and Shoreham.

New housing may well be a requirement, but is anyone there really interested in local issues? That local council admits that there is little space left to build on. To meet their imposed target, the flood plain is all that is left for such a large number of new homes. Is it sensible that they are forced to develop land for homes that has so many potential problems? Such as, further traffic on notoriously roads; as well as burdening services and water supplies further.

If local fears are proven to be correct, who compensates them for the resulting damage to their homes? Will it be a case of, bad luck, and increases in our household insurance - if indeed we can still obtain insurance when we are exposed to potential flooding?

I may be cynical, but it seems to be, that having motivated locals to voice their opinions, any opposition seems to be disregarded. Local opinions carry little weight. New development, go ahead anyway! It will be too late to undo the resulting problems once the proposed estate has been built.

It is my opinion that consultations serve little purpose, if locals have no influence in the outcome.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 599

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1033

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

1. The A27 isn't up to carrying any more traffic in or out of the area, this should be put on hold at least until a bypass is built.
  2. Also, haven't we learnt anything from other areas about what happens when an area likely to flood is built on? This area floods on a regular basis as far as Grinstead Lane, so much for all the extra drainage work that was done.  
We don't want this to get any worse or spread any further.
  3. Leave this area as it is so it can be a natural gap, allow some soak away facility.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 991

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I have reservations about the development on New Monks Farm as I think this land is unsuitable as it is a flood plain and protects the area of Lancing i.e. Mash Barn Lane, Barfield Park, Manor Park, Old Shoreham Road and Grinstead Lane. Although some of this area experienced bad flooding already in early 2013 as you know, so if any development on New Monks Farm would make this seriously worse.

And how would people be able to get insurance on any property built on such land? Also it would increase the volume of traffic which at times is at saturation point. And why do you need to built a new school when you have already closed two schools in the area, plus it would put more pressure on our main drainage in the Lancing area, which only just manages to cope now, and what about the doctor situation?

So just don't do it this plan is irresponsible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1031

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

The present road system in and around Lancing is already at full capacity. At peak times getting out of Lancing onto the Manor Roundabout to access the A27 is a nightmare and can take anywhere from 20 to 30 minutes. Before more housing is introduced to this area we need a by-pass otherwise there will be chaos on our roads.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1003

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The Brighton and Hove football ground is just near my back garden which already floods in bad weather and moves into my conservatory, and I fear that the next step would be my house.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1029

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

ANY further development increasing traffic volume interrupting what flow there is left on this section of the A27 is madness.

Developments on areas of flood risk increasing the burden on sewers will result sooner or later in an increased burden on our home insurance policies when they have to claim after the inevitable fould water problems when it all backs up in wet weather.

This locale does not have a good track record of maintenance to it's drainage systems.

I suspect these proposed sites are relatively cheap land - but what will be the long term cost to all of us and our local environment?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1028

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

I am concerned about the number of houses proposed to being built on a flood plain neither is there a need for business development in this area. The other problem this development would cause is the traffic flow on the A27. We have traffic problems now any more roundabouts and slip roads etc would cause traffic deadlock.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I am in my late seventies and have lived in Lancing since early Sixties. What Adur District Council is proposing within their strategic 16 year plan fills me with absolute trepidation.

Where I live, many of the residents are in similar situation and age group. There is tremendous concern at the proposal to build further development on the Lancing & Shoreham flood plain. Surely, last Christmas's event where in north and south Lancing the community suffered so badly for so long with flooded roads, gardens, homes with loss of toilet facilities and in the case of Grinstead Lane, even gas, is proof enough of the absolute stupidity of even contemplating this housing and business development on this slow draining flood plain.

Any infilling of concrete on New Monks Farm and the airport areas will inhibit the natural flow of surface and ground waters across this very shallow flood plain for all areas around the plain. Even the new football complex could suffer.

From the last event, it is obvious that the drainage network is not coping now particularly with the increasing trend for frequent, heavier, more prolonged wet weather. No matter what the expert say about mitigation for drainage, we who live here know instinctively this will never be possible.

It is well documented that they've said it about other locations in the UK and allowed buildings in similar situations to the heavy cost of new homeowners who have no recourse for compensation from either the developer or the authority. Insurance for the 600 homes and businesses will become impossible to obtain and as result procurement of mortgages.

What's the point of building properties where no one can obtain a mortgage!??

I insist that this proposal to build on the above areas must be categorically omitted from the authority's plan and the reasons why defended vigorously to the government inspectors.

The same applies to the proposed inclusion of a new roundabout on the A27. I am aghast at the fact that the Highways Agency are happy to agree to this when they objected 7 years ago to 100 houses being build on the same area because of the effect on this over capacity trunk road. Yet the increase of traffic flows from 600 homes and businesses is now acceptable??!!

I have absolutely no confidence in their professional opinion having seen the devastation from what was to be a 3 month improved drainage works on the same stretch of the A27, the outcome of which created the worst flooding ever experienced on this over busy trunk road.

Residents exiting Grinstead Lane, the Old Shoreham Road, Manor Road and Manor Close have extreme difficulties now. This proposed addition will make it not only considerably more difficult but extremely dangerous.

This roundabout must never happen.

We elected our councillors to look after our interests. In term of this plan they have failed miserably to do so to even allow it to go to public consultation with these severe risk elements included let alone their appalling communication of it to the public.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 22

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are writing about the proposed plans for building more homes and business development in the Lancing area (Policies 5 & 7). We would like to express our serious concerns regarding these plans.

We feel that if this goes ahead there will be even more concerns about flooding to the area. Since moving here we have learned about the terrible problems with loss of sewerage and flooded properties which many residents experienced over last Christmas into the New Year. Frequent repetition of this must be prevented at all costs. Adur must delete these proposed developments on the Adur flood plain from its plan if it has any concern for its rate paying residents in Lancing..

Also the amount of traffic this will bring onto the A27 which is a large car park already. would be totally unacceptable. Our concerns are we live on the A27 and already we have problems exiting our property onto this extremely busy trunk road. By putting a roundabout near us this will cause a continual traffic flow and even more problems for us to exit our property – made worse by the thousands of additional vehicle movements from the proposed new developments.

As our final word - we are totally against these developments which will affect the environment around us and the reasons why we moved here from Suffolk a couple of months ago.

Adur must delete policies 5 & 7 from their plan in the interests of the community's well being and have the strength to support this with the government planning agency.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 16

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We wish to register our serious concerns and objections to proposals in the Adur Draft Plan which is now in public consultation. Firstly, we are extremely worried about the increased flood risk which will inevitably be caused by the two developments suggested for building on the New Monks Farm and the airport within the Lancing and Shoreham Gap in what is a highly sensitive flood plain drainage area.

Last Christmas for a period of nearly 8 weeks, this location in the north of Lancing experienced the worst drainage issues ever to be experienced for the area – loss of sewerage, gas and flooding of gardens, garages and in some cases, homes. Areas to the south also suffered severe road flooding because the flood plain area was at over capacity.

Building 600 houses and 25,000 sq metres of business development with a school and community centre is the very last thing which must be allowed to happen in this extremely fragile flood plain drainage area.

The shallow drainage from here to Shoreham sluices, a minimal fall of just 1: 2,000, is barely coping in periods of sustained wet weather now, even if all the network of ditches is kept maintained.

To cover all these many acres with concrete by the developments on both New Monks Farm and the airport is simply asking for trouble. The draft plan acknowledges there are drainage issues in some areas but totally fails to take into account the severe event last Christmas here in north Lancing or indeed the very slow groundwater and surface water drainage across the two miles of flood plain.

I have considerable experience in the creation and maintenance of ditch and culvert drainage. I know that there is absolutely no foolproof way to mitigate for the prospective building outlined in the plan in a flood plain with only a fall of little over 1 metre in 2 miles for such a network of ditches. I certainly have no confidence in a developer who is proposing this to create a solution when the only real motive is make vast profits and move on leaving residents and the owners of the new builds with serious problems.

This development is absolute madness, unless the Adur authority is happy to continually disrupt the wellbeing of the local community and frequently invest the many hundreds of thousands of pounds it was forced to spend last Christmas and into this year for emergency drainage and remedial works.

We are adamant as ratepaying residents that these two areas must be excluded from the plan.

Adur DC has all the evidence of the Christmas event to support their exclusion with the government planning authority. It must have the strength to defend this position vigorously with any government inspector. Even David Cameron and Owen Paterson have mentioned the foolhardiness of building on flood plains and the NPPF categorically states it should be avoided.

As long term Lancing residents we demand that this flood plain development must not happen.

As for the A27 this is just totally illogical. The Highways Agency have turned down considerably smaller developments in the same area because of untenable traffic impacts on this over busy dual carriageway. Now they are happy to accept the increased traffic from 600 homes and businesses

and to boot, create a roundabout junction to deal with this??!! What madness is this??!! Just look at the A27 around Chichester! No more needs to be said.

As our local authority, we insist that Adur District Council has no option but to put the well being of its residents first and exclude these developments and the A27 options from the plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

See Email for photograph attachments.

Dear Members and Officers,

Following our recent emails on our concerns for increased flood risk by the proposed inclusion of high levels of development within the flood plain of the Lancing Shoreham Gap for the Adur District Plan, we feel we must give you our comments regarding the river flooding of the Airport last Thursday and Friday.

This incident was to do with the breaches of the banks of the River Adur because of exceptionally high tides. We know that the Environment Agency is enhancing the river and coastal flood defences with a £28 million scheme starting next year. Irrespective of this, when you bear in mind that the ICCC projected a rise in sea levels of 80cm in the coming decades, once again, it really can only be a foolish step to allow any building on this flood plain.

This event is clearly another indication of the folly of further development in this fragile area.

For your reference two photos are attached taken on Friday 6th Devember. The first shows the flooding on the north east area of the airport where 15,000 sq m of potential business development has been featured in the plan. The other gives a view of the effect to the area immediately in front of the main terminal building where aircraft can be seen with their undercarriages in the flood waters.

Once again, in the interests of the community, we ask that the elements of the Adur Plan which permit development in this flood plain must be deleted. This flood plain should be left as it is, to be allowed to flood in exceptional circumstances of prolonged rainfall with heavy ground and surface waters or when events like the one experienced last week occur.

Whilst the consultation has now passed its deadline, we feel that this email of concern should be included on the file and would welcome your confirmation that this has also been logged as comment.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 17

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Unless a car driver/owner, there is no point living/working in Lancing/Sompting due to a lack of affordable transport to work/school - return to Worthing is approx £4.90. No buses after 7.30pm - any housing development would be for car owners only. Transport costs prohibit low wage earners/families living in the district.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 18

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Building would be on flood plain. There was horrendous flooding along this area and A27 in Christmas/New Year 2012/2013. Tankers pumping water and sewage away for weeks. People unable to use toilets and bathrooms and gas on Christmas day. Even more chaos to be brought to A27. Ridiculous idea.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 19

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to these policies. The number of houses proposed in policy 3 is still far too high, and the requirement for up to 600 at New Monks Farm and 480 at West Sompting is completely unacceptable, both because of the strategic gaps and the flood risk. Also it is quite impossible to accommodate the extra traffic required, whatever measures are taken. As Adur has so few suitable sites (while there are many more in the less crowded north of England), I suggest that representations are made to the Government about the targets. If, as I suspect, the majority of people who respond to this consultation are against this level and setting of housing provision, even if the Plan is passed it should have a codicil that the respondents did not agree with these policies.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 593

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 591

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 21

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We give below our objections to the Draft Adur Plan, particularly where it refers to the proposal to build up to 600 houses in the Monks Farm area along with 10,000 sq. meters of business space and a school.

1. It is accepted that Central Government places a responsibility upon local government to provide houses where a need exists for more accommodation. What we do not accept is, firstly, that, in Adur district, there is a need for housing of the magnitude estimated by the plan. Secondly, it is a nonsense for any local authority to take the view that, where a need is identified, it is incumbent upon them to build in areas which, for a variety of reasons, may be totally unsuitable, or that Central Government could insist upon such action. The fact of the matter is that this part of the South Coast is effectively "full" and the forcing of further buildings, people and traffic into the area can only exacerbate an overcrowding problem that threatens to gridlock us completely.
2. Those of us who lived through the severe flooding problems experienced over Christmas last year, and into 2013, find the planners' apparent total disregard of the effect that the proposed building will have on drainage in this area to be completely incomprehensible. The present drainage arrangements on this floodplain are already patently incapable of coping adequately with even moderately heavy rainfall and water flowing off the downs to the North. Covering with concrete an area of the size involved in the plan can only bring about the destruction of the ability of the land to dissipate excess water, and the result will be the inundation of all of the properties relying on the drainage system, including all of the new properties themselves.
3. The Association of British Insurers (ABI) have said that around one in six homes in England and Wales is at risk of flooding and the situation is worsening. The result of this is that the cost of flood insurance will become prohibitive in many cases and impossible in others. An agreement between insurers and the Government will alleviate this problem for some but "new build" properties will be excluded. Flood insurance on new properties built on the Adur flood plain will, therefore, be unobtainable and this is bound to reflect upon the availability of mortgages for those properties. Where is the sense in insisting on building houses which cannot be sold?
4. The movement of traffic in the area is already a huge problem, especially at peak times. In the absence of a bypass around Worthing, or the reasonable prospect of one in the remotely foreseeable future, this situation can only be worsened by the building of more houses, with the associated ownership by the occupants of more vehicles. Journeys on the A27 trunk road and the A259 coast road already take far too long as a result of the volume of traffic. Adding more vehicles can only exacerbate this problem. The situation will, clearly, be worsened by the construction of either of the two roundabouts suggested for the A27 trunk road, which incorporate the potential for major accidents.
5. Whilst recognising that environmental issues are very low in the consideration of planners, development on the scale suggested in the plan will sound a death knell to much of the livestock currently inhabiting the area, including deer, wildfowl, herons, badgers and foxes. This is to say nothing of the pleasure that so many of us receive from simply looking out onto what is presently greenery instead of yet more ugly brickwork. For all of the above reasons, we object to any further building on the Adur flood plain, and in particular in the New Monks Farm area. Please acknowledge receipt of this objection.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 600

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 23

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Provided that the traffic lights at the Sussex Pad/Airport are removed.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 24

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We do not have any more room for more people to live in Lancing or Sompting. Our schools are over crowded, our doctors are over crowded, our roads are over crowded. No to more houses being built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 597

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 27

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We live on the A27 directly in front of New Monks Farm proposed development site and have major concerns on how that will impact on us with extra traffic which is always stationary now outside our house, not only at peak times, but increasingly at off peak times during the day.

Also we had an awful Christmas with the floods that had entered into the sewer system, into our bungalow via the toilet and also wrecked our garden which was under water for months, This is not going to get better with the building of 600+ homes and extra large buildings in the fields at the end of our garden.

I work locally at Ricardo so cycle to work and over the past 3 and 4 years the earth that has been built up on the gap in the so called 'golf course' is also a concern of mine, I cannot see anything from the road now whereas before you could actually see the airport buildings.

I wonder if anyone is keeping an eye out on what/how much is being dumped there on a daily basis? Whether it's solely earth and certainly, from what I've seen, it's been considerable quantities of general rubble as well, this is already severely inhibiting surface and ground water flows over this already fragile, virtually 'no fall' flood plain.

Furthermore, the impact on wildlife bothers us greatly with deer, badgers, hedgehogs, newts, foxes and squirrels all frequent users of our garden. Where are they going to end up after all the years of chaos or presumably that is of no account in the interests of developers profits with their little or no responsibility!

Building this idiotic and crazy concrete dam including the building of large units on the airport is absolutely crazy. With all the industrial space that Lancing has in abundance already. It will become a haven for lorries and even more road problems - and further congestion!

Adur DC must listen to all of us who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas into the New Year. This level of problem must never be allowed to happen again.

If the A27 was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes a number of years ago, how can the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed be acceptable to the Highways Agency???. Together with the proposed roundabout. This is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council has no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its rate paying residents.

If the plan, as it is, is put forward to the government inspector without the above exclusions, then our councillors and authority officers have totally failed the local community.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 592

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1030

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

It's complete nonsense to even consider building a housing/business development of this scale on this Flood Plain area, which has recently had incidents of flooding and which, if climate change is indeed occurring, will only get worse in the not too distant future, even without additional buildings/roads of the proposal. I have suspected for some time that the raising of the land level on the airport west side, through waste/soil tipping, is not for the supposed planned golf course but a cynical attempt by the land-owners to get planning permission for just this type of development. If it goes ahead I see Lancing being cut off by floods on a regular basis and with more traffic in/out of the area, regular traffic chaos. Common sense must prevail, not developers greed and forced-fit political policies.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I wish to register my objection the developments as outlined in the above council's draft plan as follows--

### 1 Flood Plain

Frankly it can only be described as irresponsible to even consider building on this flood plain that has been an integral part of NE Lancings drainage sluice for many generations.Last winters alarming flooding in our area will serve to illuminate how delicate the drainage situation is across this entire neighbourhood.The large concrete footprint proposed will surely act as a catalyst for even worse problems for us and our children.

### 2 Climate Change

Has anyone considered this, and if not why not?

The recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted that the way we are behaving ambient temperatures are likely to rise a max of 6 Deg C in the next century.This will result in sea levels across the planet rising by a maximum of 80cm!!.So why are you even considering building on this area which is vulnerable to flooding now ,let alone in years hence when the water levels will inevitably rise.The IPCC is not a wishy-washy green protest group it's constituent members are the cleverest scientists in the world who were nominated by their respective governments. Are these developments to be carbon neutral? Is AD/W Council doing anything constructive to reduce the amount of hydrocarbons they generate?

### 3 Traffic Congestion

Currently the stretch of the A27 from Lancing through to Worthing is one of the very worst bottlenecks in the Home Counties.With an additional 1000 odd combustion engines emptying out onto it daily will result in gridlock additional pollution and failed urban infrastructure.

### 4 Ecology/Environment

The proposed development area may look to us as being only flat and uninteresting but it is the vital supporting habitat for a diverse no. of our precious wildlife including--

x Eurasian Badger--Protected under the 1992 Badger Protection Act.There is a listed sett to the NW of the area--The Badger Trust will be making further representations on this at a later date.

xRoe Deer--A small no. of these indigenous mammals rely on their foraging in this area,and are becoming increasingly isolated--protected by the 1980 Deer Act and the 1996 Wild mammals Protection Act.

xBats--My bat detector has picked up the ultrasound signals of several types of this protected species (1981 WCA) in the Monks Farm Lane area adjacent to the deserted buildings on the E side.

xWater Voles--Protected again under the 1981 WCA,the free flowing streams in the area are known for being one of the few areas in Sussex where these precious mammals can be seen

xBirds/Water fowl--The Saltings mud flats to the adjacent E is a bird sanctuary and a wide range of our feathered neighbours seek sanctuary there,as they do on this flood plain--All wild birds and there nests are protected by the 1981WCA

Etc Etc

The draft plan depicts a relatively small 'area of ecological enhancement' where it is assumed that all the many displaced protected species will be corralled up together next to the deadly A27!--which is obviously ridiculous and probably illegal.A country park area is also outlined but no essential green 'wildlife' corridor is shown connecting the two fenced green areas..

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 42

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to any development on the New Monk Farm site. This site is a category 3b flood plain and concreting over it will bring a massive increase in flood risk to any homes built here and to the surrounding area. There was already severe flooding to homes last Christmas near this site. The A27 is already at full capacity and cannot sustain additional traffic from 600 more homes - the roundabout scheme will do nothing!

There will need to be millions spent on the local infrastructure which ADC can ill afford. There is already a shortage of doctors, dentist, hospital beds and community public services are being cut constantly. This are cannot afford or sustain such over development - very thoughtless and totally unrealistic plan! Loss of further free space - already being eaten away by the BHAFc development! Loss of further wildlife habitat. Loss of identity to Lancing as a village.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm Reference No. 1026

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:  
Flood risk to Mash Barn and increasing home insurance premiums.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1008

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The A27 cannot accommodate more traffic, the new roundabout would not solve the problem. I do not believe the flooding issue would be overcome. I do not believe adults/children would cycle or walk to their workplace or school (Middle & Secondary). Most households own at least one car so there will be more traffic. I feel such a development would put more pressure on classroom sizes, shops, park and GP surgeries. We all know any problem on the A259 or A27 causes chaos on Lancing's roads. If the proposals go ahead would this finally mean residents no longer have to pay extra Parish Council Tax for the pleasure of living in a village?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1015

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The area between Shoreham-by-Sea and Worthing is unique as it is an extremely thin piece of land between the Downs and the sea. There are only two main roads east and west A259 and the A27. Both these roads are already stretched to capacity. Those two roads simply cannot take any more traffic!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1009

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

It is so obvious that this site will flood, as there is a stream which passes through this area! And truly said, more traffic and chaos to the surrounding tenants. More attention should be shown to the need of the long awaited A27 bypass.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1014

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

We cannot cope with the traffic which we encounter now, particularly at peak times when one can be sat at the north Lancing roundabout for 1/4 hour. We have such preciously few green spaces along the coastal strip now and this is a conservancy area. We have had lapwings here and there has always been land there/ people have birdwatched, walked their dogs. Football grounds galore & access roads and ancillary buildings and now these massive proposals, all of this on what has proven to be floodland!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1013

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Traffic, traffic, traffic.

Grinstead Lane, A27, Roundabout is jammed most of the day. Queues from the railway bridge morning and evening and that's before the football cars - and now houses?

Sompting, West St is an even worse situation, already a rat run. Narrow road, the last green field.

Oppose, oppose, oppose.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1012

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The local infrastructure is already under pressure and will not cope with additional housing. The main roads are not able to deal with the extra vehicles. The hard landscaping will also greatly increase the risk of flooding.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1016

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because : This development should not be permitted until the proposed bypass leaving the A27 at the Sussex Pad and rejoining west of Worthing is built, at present the road cannot cope with the level of traffic, the occupiers of another 600 homes pouring out on to it won't help. In view of the embarrassing failure of the recent drainage improvements to the A27 (it still floods) (someone needs sueing) to build below it is madness, presumably these homes have upstairs toilets, if the toilets are downstairs when it rains they will get their own back and then sewage will be running in the streets of South Lancing. The only benefit is to the developer.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1032

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:  
Lancing is an area of large deprivation, building housing on flood plains is madness as they will not attract insurance so will not get mortgages - social housing. We do not have the infrastructure to support these sorts of large developments in Lancing or Sompting.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1007

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

This would be overdevelopment of a small remaining green space.  
It is too near Shoreham Airport where there was a fatal crash from a plane using the airport. The pilot was killed but if there were more homes in that area, many more people should have been killed.  
The flood problem we have in Lancing would become worse - damage to property and potentially people's lives at risk.  
This area is a high probability flood zone - we have been told to expect extremes of weather so flood plains should not be built on.  
More traffic on a dangerous and congested road - A27.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1019

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Following your meeting last Saturday I have the following objections to the plan.

1. Traffic congestion in West Street
  2. Environmental damage
  3. Prospect of flooding
  4. Strain on Doctors surgery
  5. Lack of school places
  6. Water shortage
  7. Increase in Domestic waste
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1006

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I have seen for myself the flooding problem in the area so more development is only going to make this worse. Also, having lived in this area for nearly 30 years I have seen traffic increase so much and Brighton and Hove football training hasn't even started yet! This is supposed to be a village!! I agree with my wife totally, the A27 is overcrowded now so what will it be like with so many houses. Also, we don't have the amenities to cope at all. BAD IDEA.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1011

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

1. The proposals, featuring the build of so many new homes, would clearly add significantly to the already horrendous traffic problems frequently experienced during the rush hour, can be considerable, and so many new homes, with the additional cars they would inevitably bring, would just exacerbate the traffic problems on a key Sussex route.

2. If the area in question is designated a high probability flood zone (demonstrated by the recent flooding problems on the A27), it defies common sense to build new homes on that area. One wonders who would wish to buy such homes if there are likely to be flooding issues in every wet weather.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1005

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Watching the TV showing other councils building on flood plains and the terrible effect it can have to the poor home owners, we really do NOT want that to happen here.

As it is my back garden floods in the winter after prolonged rain. Surely the council can find better areas to A27 are busy enough.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1021

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks Farm site because:

It is a site which is liable to flooding. Therefore impractical for development.

It will result in a lot more traffic, especially on A27, which is already badly congested especially at peak times.

The area is already overpopulated and this will impinge on one of the only green areas left.

Do not let Lancing become a complete urban sprawl.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1022

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

The flooding issues that have been identified in the Old Salts Farm land are the same as at New Monks Farm. In fact it is the same flood plain and if building is allowed the existing homes will be at risk of flooding as well as those in the West Beach (formerly Hasler) Estate because groundwater will be displaced. The same volume of water must still flow through and under the flood plain but concrete and tarmac don't absorb water and pipes have a finite capacity so flooding is going to be inevitable.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1023

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

There is a flooding problem in the area which is probably why it hasn't been built on before. Also the amount of extra cars brought to an area that already has constant traffic with very busy peak times. It would lead to overcrowded roads. Or maybe building on flood plains people living there would be travelling by boat? It must be quite obvious why these areas should not be built on. Just follow common sense.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1024

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks Farm site because: The A27 struggles to cope with today's traffic twice a day at least so it would exacerbate these problems quite considerably hence I would urge a rethink of the proposals to develop at New Monks Farm site.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1004

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I object to the new development for housing, business development and school on above site. The surrounding areas suffers greatly with lack of drainage and flooding. Any further development could cause huge problems on an already inferior infrastructure. I am sure we were one of the lucky ones last year when it flooded, my driveway and garden christmas day. My two young children had to walk over sewerage to get to my car. Shame on Southern water and WSCC. The roads in this area especially A27 has always been awful further development will make it much worse.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1010

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

With the increase in temperatures even wetter weather is likely and to put more housing in an area with a large change of flooding is stupid. Once again money gains the upper hand over sensibility. Leave the flood plain known as the Gap alone.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1025

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

The risk of flooding is a major concern in this area as anyone who had the misfortune to be on the A27 last year would know!!! Also traffic on that stretch of road is a nightmare now I cannot believe they are considering a huge development like this its crazy!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: New Monks Farm

Reference No. 1017

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I want Adur Council to change the proposals in the Adur Draft Local plan for the New Monks farm site because:

Having attended the meeting at the Lancing Parish Hall, we would like to object to the proposed development of the area at the back of the Mash Barn estate and Sompting for the following reasons:

- The current roadway cannot take the amount of traffic that currently runs through Lancing and the Manor roundabout is extremely dangerous and difficult to negotiate especially from the North and South of Lancing. More development in this area will make this even more of a nightmare than it already is.
  - Flood risk and the fact it is a flood plain make no sense whatsoever to build on this area. Having already been affected by the flood disruption we do not want it to be made worse. The environment agency and the planning people all accepted this to be a major problem and it makes no common sense to build in an area like this. Not only could it cause more flood issues in the area but from an insurance point of view any insurance company would be opposed to covering buildings at such risk.
  - We also do not see the need for more industrial units to be built when half of the Churchill industrial estate sits empty with to let signs everywhere.
  - Sompting development will cause more traffic issues where it is used as a rat run anyway and regularly gridlocks during peak times.
- Lancing just cannot cope with this and we are losing al lot of what is special about the village!

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.54**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.54

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I thought this agricultural land was acting as drainage from run off of the A27 and as a floodplain from airport and river. If you build upon it, it will change the dynamics and cause further flooding.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.55**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.55

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Woodland would have to be managed and also what guarantee will be of the trees taking on excess flood water.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.56**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.56

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Current wildlife habitat would be disturbed and no guarantee of wildlife habitation of area.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.57**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.57

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Change for roundabout instead of lights on A27 is not feasible based on traffic usage, plus the current spate of accidents within that stretch of roadway. Unless the lights are staying and roundabout extra but that would put 2 roundabouts within less than 1/2 a mile and the queues would prove more problematic that at moment. Also visitors to Lancing College.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.57

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority wishes to see greater reference made in paras 2.57 and 2.87 regarding the roundabout options on the A27 to minimising the potential landscape impact of the proposals and that the existing evidence in suggests that the eastern option is the more sensitive location in landscape terms, and indeed is immediately adjacent to the South Downs National Park.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.58**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.58

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I am not aware of any bus routes that already use the route. There is cycle path one side of A27.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.59**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.59

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

How do householders get to Grinstead Lane if you shut off access?

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.60**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.60

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Agent's Organisation

2.60: This paragraph should be reviewed to ensure that it is in conformity with the recently published DFT Circular 02/2013 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'. Paragraph 18 of this circular places emphasis on the Local Plan stage to identify appropriate capacity enhancements on the Strategic Road Network. Please contact the Highways Agency for further details.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.60

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

Based on current observations I think you are aware of all the side roads with problems.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.60

Reference No. 907

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having studied the draft Local Plan, as a resident of North Lancing, my main concern is with the predicted impact of additional traffic from new developments on the area generally and on the A27/Grinstead Lane/Manor Road junction in particular. I note that, at paragraph 2.60, the draft Plan recognises the need for improvements to this junction and also that the summary Transport Assessment attached suggests specific works.

I would be grateful for an assurance that no decisions have been taken in respect of such works and that there will be full public consultation, particularly in this area, as part of the further Transport Assessment referred to in paragraph 2.60.

As part of such future work, I would also welcome further detailed analysis of the junction options for the New Monks Farm development on the Grinstead Lane junction and the A27 generally.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.61**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.61

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Flood Risk Management

Key issues and dependencies: For the New Monks Farm paragraph, please add 'Any application will have to demonstrate that current flood risk from all sources is mitigated, that flood risk to other areas is not increased and that where possible flood risk overall is reduced'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.61

Reference No. 1165

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I find it staggering that there is building on the flood plain the site lies predominately in Flood Zone 3A. Who will tell the purchasers/renters of these properties that their insurance costs will be much higher if they can even find insurance. The date 1st April 2012 should be remembered as this was when Southern Water imposed a hose pipe ban.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.65**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 05: Para 2.65

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Could the existing site be increased and modernised in size to take care of mitigating problem. As you are proposing to build at New Monk Farm.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.67 onwards**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.67 onwards

Reference No. 523

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I wish to oppose the proposed plans to build 480 homes in the west of the village of Sompting (West Sompting: Strategic Allocation Para's 2.67 onwards).

I have lived in Sompting and worked in the area for over 40 years, and have seen the village grow in that time to the size it is today. To build these houses will make it a large housing estate with the following already in place: a school, 2 pubs, 1 restaurant, 1 fish and chip shop and a convenience store.

The roads in the area and through the village have become rat-runs despite the traffic calming scheme; this is due to the increase of traffic heading west on the A27, so to add more homes means an increase in vehicles on the village roads which are already a hazard and would affect current residents who already park their cars on these roads.

Since the middle of 1970, Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council have clearly defined the village as a Conservation Area. The strategic gap between Sompting and Worthing came about, I believe, due to an understanding between the councils of Worthing and Sompting not to build on this green belt as it would be detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

In 2011, a previous Planning Application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government inspector (Feb 2011): 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on the highway safety and the free flow of the traffic through the village.

On a final point, I do believe the proposed site that is intended to be built on is a known flood plain.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.67-2.80**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.67-2.80

Reference No. 931

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Persimmon Homes South Coast

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Turley Associates

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

Our client has commissioned further assessments of the area and will provide these to the LPA to update these paragraphs as necessary prior to the publication of the Pre-Submission consultation version of this Plan.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.67-2.81**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.67-2.81

Reference No. 908

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

This plans raises a number of issues with:

- 1) Traffic: The proposal for traffic calming measures will not reduce the current high volume of traffic dropping down off the A27 to rat run through West Street causing huge problems with congestion. Alternative routes through to East Worthing need to be identified.
  - 2) Flooding: Not only does Sompting have issues with water running off the South Downs but with heavy rain the aquifer under the Weald fills up and springs appear along the bottom of the South Downs many surfacing in Sompting.
  - 3) Schools, Doctors, Dentists, Hospitals: These are all currently under pressure with the existing population, things will only get worse.
  - 4) Water Supply and Sewage: Is there sufficient capacity to cope with the proposed extra demand.
  - 5) Bus Services: The bus service for West Sompting is poor and will not service the extra demand from this plan
-

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.68**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.68

Reference No. 898

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The proposal for the provision of 480 dwellings on the two sites constitutes overdevelopment which is unable to be sustained by the existing community infrastructure. Furthermore, no major development should be permitted in Sompting until the Worthing by-pass has been built as the serious historic traffic problems experienced in the village will only continue whilst congestion of westbound traffic emanating from the A27 Lyons Farm junction remains unresolved. The addition of a further 480 households averaging two cars per household will only exacerbate the current situation and will have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.68

Reference No. 896

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Proposal for the provision of 480 dwellings on the two sites constitutes overdevelopment which is unable to be sustained by the existing community infrastructure. Furthermore, no major development should be permitted in Sompting until the Worthing by-pass has been built as the serious historic traffic problems experienced in the village will only continue whilst congestion of westbound traffic emanating from the A27 Lyons Farm junction remains unresolved. The addition of a further 480 households averaging two cars per household will only exacerbate the current situation and will have a significant detrimental impact on the local environment.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.68  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 931  
Organisation Persimmon Homes South Coast  
Agent's Organisation Turley Associates

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

Add in the words, 'land for a potential community use' after 'community orchard' to reflect latest masterplan for the site (see attached). Our client considers this land is well screened and capable of delivering an additional community benefit without adverse harm to the Local Green Gap. Given our client does not control all of the land required to deliver the pedestrian and cycle access across the gap referred to, we would suggest for clarity the text makes clear the allocation will deliver the part of this route that lay within Adur District, with the remainder delivered by Worthing Borough Council.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.68  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 914  
Organisation  
Agent's Organisation

Will the pedestrian and cycle route meet up with the current National Cycle routes in area or be elsewhere.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.69**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.69  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 914  
Organisation  
Agent's Organisation

How much of this will already be disturbed by the Rampion project.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.70**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.70

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references in para.2.70 to:

- (i) the acknowledgement that the Sompting strategic allocation site is of high visual sensitivity and of medium - high overall landscape sensitivity, and is visible from a number of sensitive viewpoints within the National Park
  - (ii) that, as a consequence, any new development within the Sompting Fringe area must be designed sensitively and
  - (iii) development proposals must minimise the impact of development on the landscape.
- 

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.74**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.74

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Based on the problems with cars parked and bus at the moment how is it expected that Loose Lane will cope with the extra influx. Also by making priority onto West Street this will increase the tension of drivers already held up each morning due to A27 off flows and commuters.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.75**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.75

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

As Dankton Lane is already bottle necked when A27 accidents how can improvements be made. Plus no mention of Church Lane which also has same problem.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.75 Reference No. 896  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Improvements to the A27/Dankton Lane junction are likely to result in an increase in traffic flow through the village and would therefore, have significant negative impact.

Various road improvement measures have been previously implemented in Sompting Village Conservation Area without significant success and it is unlikely that any further improvements could be undertaken which would not have a detrimental effect on its historic character.

Please see separate sheet for additional comments.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.75 Reference No. 898  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Improvements to the A27/Dankton Lane junction are likely to result in an increase in traffic flow through the village and would therefore, have significant negative impact.

Various road improvement measures have been previously implemented in Sompting Village Conservation Area without significant success and it is unlikely that any further improvements could be undertaken which would not have a detrimental effect on its historic character.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.76**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.76 Reference No. 914  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

If you are putting in further traffic calming measures then any development onto West Street would not act as a TCM. Also due to householders it is very difficult to widen West Street any more. Plus sometimes LGV, HGVs do not take notice of the signs about width restrictions.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.76

Reference No. 898

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The extension of traffic calming measures along West Street will not address the underlying problem of traffic volume which would only increase with the addition of the proposed development of 480 dwellings. It is my view that any measures undertaken would have minimal benefit. 960 vehicles travelling at 20mph is still 960 vehicles!!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.76

Reference No. 896

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The extension of traffic calming measures along West Street will not address the underlying problem of traffic volume which would only increase with the addition of the proposed development of 480 dwellings.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.77**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.77

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.77: As for 2.60 above, this paragraph should be reviewed to ensure that it is in conformity with the recently published DFT Circular 02/2013 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'. Paragraph 18 of this circular places emphasis on the Local Plan stage to identify appropriate capacity enhancements on the Strategic Road Network. Please contact the Highways Agency for further details.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.77 Reference No. 898

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

To be of any significant benefit, any Transport Assessment would need to include the A27 Lyons Farm junction and the impact on local roads and junctions due to continued heavy westbound congestion. It is not considered that any improvements to local roads etc would be effective whilst the cause of the main underlying problem namely, the lack of a by-pass for Worthing remains unresolved.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.77 Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

Feasibility studies have been done in previous years and no clear decision has ever been made.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.77 Reference No. 896

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Organisation

Agent's Organisation

To be of any significant benefit, any Transport Assessment would need to include the A27 Lyons Farm junction and the impact on local roads and junctions due to continued heavy westbound congestion. It is not considered that any improvements to local roads etc would be effective whilst the cause of the main underlying problem namely, the lack of a by-pass for Worthing remains unresolved.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.78**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.78

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

With any new build on the sites it will displace any groundwater and what guarantees do existing householder have that floods will not affect them. Especially if the existing capped streams (A27 and village) get breached.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.79**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.79

Reference No. 896

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Research is not conclusive, but it is considered that occupants of dwellings located within 50 metres of overhead power lines may be at risk due to the proximity and exposure to strong electro-magnetic fields which may be detrimental to health. The density of the proposed development makes it difficult to appreciate how this can be satisfactorily achieved without removal of the existing high voltage overhead power lines or otherwise exposing future households to potential risk.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.79

Reference No. 898

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Research is inconclusive, but it is considered that occupants of dwellings located within 50 metres of overhead power lines may be at risk due to the proximity and exposure to strong electro-magnetic fields which could be detrimental to health. The density of the proposed development makes it difficult to appreciate how this can be satisfactorily achieved without removal of the existing high voltage overhead power lines or otherwise exposing future households to potential risk.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.80**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.80

Reference No. 896

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Existing and proposed housing density in the locality is high and I do not consider that it would be appropriate for seven Gypsy Traveller pitches and one travelling show people plot to be included in the development proposals. In my view this would not benefit good community relations and I believe that such sites, whilst considered essential, should not be located within established residential areas, or in any immediately adjoining development which would be the case in this instance.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.80

Reference No. 898

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Existing and proposed housing density in the locality is high and I do not consider that it would be appropriate for seven Gypsy Traveller pitches and one travelling show people plot to be included in the development proposals. In my view this would not benefit good community relations and I believe that such sites, whilst considered essential, should not be located within established residential areas or in any immediately adjoining development which would be the case in this instance.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.80

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

No objection to Travellers and Gypsy encampment provided it is up to European Standards and whether it will be a set lease of land for either 999 years or 99years. Also self-policed by the Gypsy Council of UK.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.81**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: Para 2.81

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Also an undertaking for Archaeological dig (not short one) due to the Roman Road and Knight Templars that used this route ages ago.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 126

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 127

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 496

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 495

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 125

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 124

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 121

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 128

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 137

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No to the 480 new homes to be built in the village of Sompting.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 119

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 494

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 131

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Speeding down this road is bad enough without anymore traffic.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 493

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 132

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 492

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 491

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village . ( GOOD )
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway. ( BAD ENOUGH NOW )
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour. ( NO MORE SO HELP! )
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs. ( YES )
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area. ( POTENTIAL DISASTER IF THIS IS IGNORED )
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community. ( YES - AGREE )
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain. ( DISASTER IF EVEN ANY PART GOES THRO )

P.S. Also close UK borders now.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 497

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 135

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

It's so poorly thought out, this plan doesn't add up.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 500

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 490

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 133

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 102

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Please leave our village as it is. It can't take much more.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 82

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to you to ask that you accept this letter as my formal objection to the recently published version of the Adur Draft Local Plan and in particular the suggested build of approximately 480 dwellings at West Sompting.

My reason as to why I am against this development are: -

1/ The Sompting Gap is hugely important as a wildlife corridor and this on its own makes it worth preserving, the strategic gaps are especially essential to stop Sompting merging into Worthing or Lancing into Sompting which would create an over populated urban coastal strip. It is there to preserve the separate identity and character of the area.

2/ We are UNIQUE in the Adur district because we are in a narrow strip of land between the South Downs National Park to the North and the sea to the South meaning that there are fewer gaps left between what is already a built up area and for this reason we cannot be expected to take any further development.

3/ If we allow this development to proceed it would set a dangerous precedent for many more applications being made for inappropriate development.

4/ Traffic congestion would get worse. West Street is already a nightmare on a daily basis because it is used by impatient and aggressive drivers using it as a RATRUN trying to bypass congestion on the A27, the traffic calming measures that already exist do not work in reducing the amount of traffic or the speed that they are travelling, so further traffic management of extending traffic calming and intensifying existing measures will have no effect/benefit for West Street whatsoever. Emergency services already have difficulty carrying out their job around West Street and Sompting.

5/ Sompting and Sompting Village were also mentioned by the WSCC Highways that no more developments should be considered until A27 traffic situation was dealt with.

6/ Flooding is also a problem around West Street and this will only increase and get worse if additional properties are built within the area.

7/ The infrastructure for these additional houses is not in place, we already have appalling roads, under manning and under equipped emergency services, overstretched medical services, declining bus services, overcrowding of schools and we do not have the water/sewerage capacity.

Please take my views into account when considering this plan; in addition I would like to be kept informed of any further changes or plans regarding the local plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 513

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 83

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.81 page 46. "Policy would have a number of positive economic benefit". No mention anywhere of what these benefit are.

2.80 page 45. 480 new homes. Where do the children go to secondary school? RW academy is already full.

2.80 "Expansion of the traffic calming in West Street". How is this possible?

2.80 A27 is already congested. Access via Dankton Lane is dangerous, due to cars speeding after traffic lights, poor visibility.

Page 45 "Development must respect the Worthing/Sompting gap". How in this possible in the gap is going to be reduced.

The plan is full of vague descriptions of things that need to happen, but very little detail. As an example "Provision of transport infrastructure including improve public transport". Statement no detail to back up. How is this going to be achieved? What new transport?

It is my understanding that the plan has to improve/provide improvements for the current residents, not just new housing for new residents. There is very little to compensate for 480 new houses/600 new cars and 1000 people.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 84

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I was born and bred in Sompting, my mum still lives in Sompting. I have 3 children that love to visit grandma, but we have been stuck along West Street almost every time we go to visit. The A27 is just a car - park / Western Road. Just as busy Sompting is just stuck in the middle of 3 roads that are all fast becoming car - parks. How anyone can think that building 480 homes in Sompting is Right! Needs to live there for a few days, to see how isolated you can feel. The ONLY thing Sompting has going for it now is the Green Belt. Some of it has been built and with even more access to West Street. What about the wildlife that has been on that land for 100 of years. Are you sure what is trying to happen is legal?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 510

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This development would cause an increase in traffic congestion in an area that is already extremely congested. Suggested traffic calming measures (of which there is little detail) would only exacerbate the problem.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 85

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I don't want new houses because I will get the brunt of the noise, dirt, local parking, I have moved down here to be near my family and peace and quiet because of our age. We live right next to the field where you intend building, so I don't think you are thinking of us around this area because we are a nice community plus a lot of us are in sheltered flats.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 89

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Sompting will no longer be the village long time residents have come to love and appreciate, and traffic through the village become terrible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 91

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

If this build goes ahead it would be disadvantage to everyone. At present it takes me half hour to get onto the main area of A27, that would increase no end if new houses were built with houses having at least one car. This would increase in time and cause even more time to get out of Sompting and travel to work.

Just feel that we need to concentrate on what we have already and improve and not create more.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 95

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am concerned about the traffic increase in our road as it appears from map that there will be a road from new estate to East Worthing. If this is the case the traffic that now runs rat race along West Street will I am sure use this road out to East Worthing then traffic from the 400 homes will be using this road. Either way this is concerning as there is a school and two nursery schools at the end of the road.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 100

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposal development of 480 homes of West Street, Loose Lane in Sompting, will create an even greater traffic congestion in to Sompting Village area, there is not enough schools places, more strain on its doctors surgeries. The bus service is reduced. One accident on the A27 at a New Lyons Farm and the village become a no go area. This development will generate at least another 1500 car journey a day. Probably not enough parking either.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 101

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 499

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 504

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 118

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 503

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 104

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 502

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 105

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway. - West St/Busticle Lane junction need roundabout.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

- Doctors, hospitals and clinics lack capacity.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 501

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 487

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 106

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 114

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 498

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 115

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 116

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 103

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .

2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.

3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.

6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 465

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 489

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 154

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 471

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 470

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 155

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 156

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 157

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 469

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Its bad enough now, let alone with more houses being built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 158

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 468

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 472

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 466

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 152

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 464

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 463

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 462

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 461

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I cannot take anymore traffic.

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Leave Sompting to be a Village.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 159

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 460

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 459

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 160

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 161

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 458

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 467

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 479

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 81

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It's an absolute joke to build houses on land that floods, we have no provision for the added number of people, kids they need schooling, doctors, dentists etc.. Sompting cannot cope with the traffic issue it currently has, I walk my dogs quicker than the traffic moves in Sompting, how the hell is a residential street (Loose lane) going to cope with the additional traffic. And that's without the wildlife issue (what we will lose). I don't want a housing estate built in my back garden, we don't have any facilities to accommodate what could be 2500+people+cars.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 488

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We were sent this letter by 'Save Our Sompting' and they had already ticked the 'object' box on the letter for us. However, we support the idea of regeneration of Sompting, so we are returning our letter in support of the council's plans.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 74

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 139

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No to the 480 new houses for Sompting. This is still a village not a town.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 486

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 485

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 484

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 483

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 482

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 481

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 153

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 140

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 138

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 478

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

National water supplies under 'pressure'.

National gas/ electricity supply under pressure.

Lack of school places.

Lack of sufficient hospitals/ doctor's surgeries.

Ugly housing estate of 'small boxes' unsuitable for cohesive family life.

Building on flood plains.

Overcrowding all of the South East.

Too many immigrants being catered for adding to overcrowding.

Ridiculous road system for all the additional traffic.

Adverse social implication of a travellers camp in Sompting providing a base for wealthy travellers with homes elsewhere.

No work ( high unemployment ).

All infrastructure.

There are so many more reasons, as per local council meeting to reject the proposed housing in Sompting

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 477

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

We must stop the planning.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 476

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 475

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 145

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage

INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 474

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 149

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

What you need to spend those millions of pound is a by pass. Just can't imagine what the traffic will be like if you build all those houses, would have to leave for work 2 hours before needing to be there, its bad enough as it is.

The worst thing you could ever do!!!

Just try and think of all of us that live in Sompting!!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 150

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

I lived in Dankton Lane for several years, before moving, only because I needed a bungalow. It is such a lovely lane, please leave it, Sompting is a lovely place to live.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 151

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 473

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 480

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 577

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 521

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 584

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 3) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 4) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 59

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

West Sompting (map3)

Sompting does not have the infrastructure to accommodate another 480 houses.

The village roads are already congested without adding to the problem.

Insufficient primary and secondary schools, doctors, struggles, already overloaded.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 583

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .

2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.

3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.

4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.

5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 60

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The road structures are no where near good enough to cope with all the extra traffic that would be in the area. There is the flooding problems at the brook area. There are not enough doctors, schools, fire, hospital capacity to cope with the additional amount of people. We have bus one an hour, none on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The last bus in the area is 17:48 to Worthing and 18:40 from Worthing. So that will mean a lot more cars.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 582

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 61

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 5

The traffic is so dangerous along West Street, my wife had a Heart Attack a couple of Month ago and the Ambulance had terrible Trouble getting along West Street my wife nearly DIED. How they will ever get ambulances, Fire - Engines or Police cars through when there is a Possibility of 480 - 1440 more cars coming through Sompting. Disaster waiting to happen.

We have a duty of trust to protect green belt land for FUTURE GENERATION.

Around 1948 - 5`1 A Clause was in force for 100 years that the Green belt land you are trying to build on would / could not be built in that 100 years. There is still 35-38 approx. years left. Or was that a total lie from Sompting Estates??

This whole plan is a disaster waiting to happen. You will be sued / blamed / accused if anyone gets hurt or God forbid killed.

There are 14 green belts in England, which "ring" urban areas and provide space for agriculture, forestry and leisure.

The Communities Secretary opposes any more to unpick his new planning framework and ease restrictions on building on the green belt, The Sunday Telegraph understands.

Tory MPs have hit out against to proposals. Chris Skidmore, who has campaigned to protect the green belt in his Kingswood constituency, said: "Protecting the green belt is not simply a case of saying 'not in my back yard' ".

"We have a duty of trust to protect green belt land for future generation. It is right that the NPPF contained specific protections".

The MP for Enfield North, described himself as a "growth zealot", but added: "While we have many barriers to infrastructure projects, and we should be easing those, any plans that allow major housing estates on the shrinking green belt would be flawed as they would fly in the face of neighbourhood plans. I don't see how the government can square the circle on this one".

The MP for Chatham and Aylesford, said: " It is essential that we protect the green belt. It would be quite wrong for the Coalition to take away the green belt from the next generation, which is already burdened with the debt left to it by the last Labour government."

The "Quad" meeting - over dinner nine years ago - was said to have been dominated by the desperate need to come up with ideas to stimulate growth and to fill a planned Economic Regeneration Bill to be published in the autumn, which will fill the "hole" in the government's legislative plans caused by the decision to abandon reform of the House of Lords.

There are separate Green bets surrounding nearly all the major towns in Britain. Their principle purposes are to:

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built - up areas.

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging.

Assist in safeguarding the countryside.

Preserve the setting and character of historic towns.

To assist and encourage urban regeneration.

The extent of the Green Belt in your locality will be identified on the Proposals Maps contained within a Local Plan or Unitary development Plan etc. for your area.

Within the Green Belt permission to carry out 'development' is severely restricted and planning consent is only granted in a limited if circumstances. These include:

- certain agriculture and forestry related building and uses.
- outdoor sporting uses and essential ancillary facilities.
- minor works to existing residential properties.
- works of national interest or importance.

In the main the majority of proposals for development will only be granted planning permission if they can justify that there are "very special

circumstances" why permission should be granted.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 581

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 62

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 5

Sompting means "Marshy Land" I have lived in Peveril Close since 1951 my parents were there from the day the houses built. I have seen so many changes but the very worst is the traffic along West Street where I now live. I take my life in my own hands if I go for a walk. I never dare to walk with my grandchildren it's far too Dangerous along West Street. We cannot cope with 480 houses 480 - 1440 cars. There is plenty of room for houses if you get rid of the factories that stand empty. Or use the brown belt or do a few houses in certain gaps. Don't ruin our village (Sompting) by creating more flooding more traffic. Ruin more Flint walls and more danger to us residents. Ambulances Fire - Engines can't get through even now without major problems. Sompting can't cope. Just ask the Fire Brigade they know how dangerous this plan is .

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 64

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map

I think that the amount of houses being built is too many, will spoil our village and surroundings.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 585

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 66

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am disgusted that you are proposing to build 480 new homes on the Sompting green gap there is no infrastructures in place, doctors, roads, parking, etc. you can not move in the village now with traffic coming of the A27 so what will it be like if this goes ahead. The Government pulled the plug on the new by-pass 20 years ago that is why Sompting is in turmoil with cars and this will just add to the mayhem.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 57

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

After living in Sompting for over 50 years and seen the gradual increase in building on brown field sites. Also Western Road estate and Rectory Farm estate and over these years there has been vast increase in ownership and cars which add to the congestion.

During this period no improvements were made to the A27 only a dual carriageway to the new flyover from Lyons Farm to link up with the Brighton by pass. They used call the new link from Dover to Honiton by pass!!, now it is almost nose to tail traffic at peak times.

All these minor changes have put severe pressure on Sompting particularly in the village with all its flooding problems and it restriction of traffic flow, it is only one way on certain sections, more so when there is a road accident, which seems to be more frequent these days. The buses have difficulty getting though this narrow road, due to parked cars.

While we do need a few more affordable homes, particularly for young people who have gone to school here and married. I think the flooding problems need to be addresses first. Then look at less housing or more until the water flooding problems has been resolved. Also better control of traffic during the peak period. The car parking problems in Sompting need to be addressed to improve traffic flow as with additional building the level of local traffic will increase.

We do need another road to the A259 from Sompting area as Grinstead Lane, Western Road and Sompting Road have become totally unsuitable for the volume and type of traffic, that uses it at peak times.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 576

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 575

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 574

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 573

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 572

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 571

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 570

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 569

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 568

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 567

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My thinking is:

If you bring in another 5000+ people into this area, the infrastructure at present is not fit for purpose. The result would be very dire indeed!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 65

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the proposed plan because the roads are already congested, Drs Surgery and NHS are no longer coping. Also ours schools are already full. Before long there will be no green belt anywhere in Britain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 590

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1166

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

REF: Building 400+ houses at Sompting.

Doubtless Whitehall despotism requires that West Sussex provides a quota of additional houses in its area.

Top priority must be viability against all criteria:

Where are the jobs for additional families?

Hospital capacity is barely sufficient for existing population.

Road congestion is already severe and costly for local enterprises.

Continual concreting is exacerbating draining problems in general.

In particular, Loose Lane area is grazing, not arable because it is too wet to grow crops.

Of all the topography locally, this area is ultimately liable to problems generated by sea level increase.

**BIG PICTURE.**

Why should we have our environment continually abused by failure up the line to control demand on our housing stock, generated by uncontrolled immigration?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 593

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 6

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the draft plan for the following reasons:

- 1) Traffic Congestion – West Street Sompting and the filter roads into the road are already heavily congested to the point of stand still at rush hours. I have to use West Street everyday to commute to and from work and its horrific at rush hour. The alternative route is A27 which is equally as bad, hence West Street, as identified in the draft proposal, is used as a rat run. The area cannot take on any more congestion at either of the sites proposed in West Sompting.
- 2) Environmental Impact – I live in the area of West Street and regularly see Barn Owls, Badgers, storks and Bats in this immediate vicinity. The development of the land in this area would destroy these animal's habitats. Also an increase in traffic would have a negative impact on the environment as there would be even more vehicle travelling at low speeds or in stand still traffic.
- 3) Insufficient local services – The local GP practice is already heavily prescribed with over 800 patients as I understand it. I cannot get my family into a local NHS dentist as they too are oversubscribed. There is currently a "baby boom" and with the increase in immigration, the local schools are already struggling to cope with demand. The local Police are already struggling to cope with the current state of affairs in Sompting, with it being one of the most poverty deprived areas of the UK. An increase in homes within the west Sompting and the Monks draft proposal Without an increase in Police numbers is putting people's lives at risk
- 4) Flooding – The area of West Street regularly floods and often owing to the height of the water table, this water does not soak away for several weeks. Should the land be built upon, this situation will only get worse, and I have genuine concern that mine and my neighbours properties would be at risk of flooding.

Whilst I support the idea that we need new homes owing to the well documented rise in immigration and birth statistics, I do not feel that this draft plans has considered anything other than where there is available land that potentially could be built on.

Would it not be better to efficiently redesign current areas such as Millfield in Sompting which currently do not make the best use of the available space. The area is significant with regards crime within the Sompting area and looks dreadful leading to some individuals living In those areas having little respect for their surroundings or others property.

I note the proposals of a traveller and gypsy site – this is not something that I think Sompting can take on with regards the current state of Policing in this or the immediate area nor is there sufficient land available that would allow these individuals to store caravans / trucks and often horses in additions to living in a permanent structure.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 19

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to these policies. The number of houses proposed in policy 3 is still far too high, and the requirement for up to 600 at New Monks Farm and 480 at West Sompting is completely unacceptable, both because of the strategic gaps and the flood risk. Also it is quite impossible to accommodate the extra traffic required, whatever measures are taken. As Adur has so few suitable sites (while there are many more in the less crowded north of England), I suggest that representations are made to the Government about the targets. If, as I suspect, the majority of people who respond to this consultation are against this level and setting of housing provision, even if the Plan is passed it should have a codicil that the respondents did not agree with these policies.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 24

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We do not have any more room for more people to live in Lancing or Sompting. Our schools are over crowded, our doctors are over crowded, our roads are over crowded. No to more houses being built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 592

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 28

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We have lived in our house 38 years this month, when we moved in we were told by the council the field next to us would not be built on because it is greenbelt land! Now we hear that the council are building houses on the view we have of Worthing and fields if we knew that in the first place we would never have bought our house and should have taken the advice of estate agents that have always said the view would sell our property. To say We Are Angry Doesn't come into it!! And we have just read you are giving green space for development and accommodation to travellers and a gypsy site which our small village cannot cope with let alone traffic, shops, doctors etc. The already congested A27 is going to make a huge impact on traffic in West Sussex and surrounding areas.

Who do we approach for compensation? I.e: - you're going to devalue our house!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 29

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No comment found.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 591

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 30

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

South of Sylvan Road is Green Gap/Green Belt! Agricultural Land! Corn fields! The farmer will not bother to farm half the field. Someone will have to maintain it?

There is plenty of room North of the A27?

Some has rubbish dumped all over it?

South of Sylvan Road is the Green Gap between Adur and Arun. A corridor for wild life? The fields are in use for Agriculture! Corn.

Sompting is too small for the amount of traffic already, would suggest a visit in Term Time 8:30 until 10 and again lunch time and evenings to view traffic congestion and rat run from A27!!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 58

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map area 3

I object of these plans as this area is not suitable - the roads are unable to cope with current traffic without levels without another potential 480 cars. Dankton Lane and West Street are village roads and quickly become gridlocked. We don't have enough school places, shops, community space for current residents. Any additional housing will impact heavily on people already living here.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 33

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposed house-building sites in Sompting

I accept we must have some new homes possibly some retirement houses which could free up some of the properties on the Rectory Farm estate. The majority of the people are trades people but a few myself and other neighbours have raised our families and our houses could be sold to families if there were smaller affordable properties in the area for sale. I'd like as few houses built as possible as this is a village with green areas for wildlife and we don't want more traffic in the village, we have enough as it is coming down our lanes from the A27. We live here and it is difficult sometimes for us to get to our home. Most homes have at least one car/van or both as most people who live here work outside the village. We don't want more traffic. We need to retain the character of our village for future generations. Not diminish it with more buildings.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 564

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

#### Other Comments:

Let there be a major development to the A27 westbound. It needs a by-pass up over the downs! It has been talked about for years but there has been no action.If this were to be solved then the infill of more houses could be thought about. Traffic and parking has always been a major problem!!

We hear so much about houses built in flood risk areas and should not be allowed. How do councils think that a resident can get a satisfactory insurance, knowing that there could be a flood risk.

The road 'West Street' has to have a better priority sign for oncoming traffic. Signs in place are not obeyed by the greater part of traffic flow. Red light - stop - green light - go. Thought to be more obvious.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 45

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1. Increase of traffic will cause major problems ie. access to Dankton Lane and through Sompting village.
  2. Lack of infrastructure ie schools spaces for new pupils, health facilities, will current surgery cope with the increase of patients.
  3. The village of Sompting will lose its identity and the area will just merge into one and no longer be semi-rural.
  4. Due to the lack of rural aspect property prices will be affected, possible downturn. Because will not buy where there estates being built along side one another.
  5. Homes being built under powers lines and near pylons has there been consultation with National Grid.
  6. Will sewage be able to cope to drain away and the possibility of flooding in the area.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 47

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have been informed by a neighbour of the intention to build 480 new homes on Sompting green gap!  
+ Travellers site!!!  
I have lived here for 40 years having purchased my house several years ago.  
I am in my 90s and feel very anxious and nervous about these plans.  
I strongly object to the proposals.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 48

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am one of the dreaded migrants from Brighton having only moved to the area in February 2013 so I can sympathise with those looking for an affordable house, as I was renting a house with my sister which our landlord decided to sell but we could not afford.

Location was not a key part of our search, only something with 2 bedrooms and garden preferably a house, (as maintenance fees on flats seem to be almost extortion these days), and transport links such as buses and a railway station in order for us to be able to get work in Hove.

Since moving to Sompting however I have come to appreciate the location more and more. The quiet in the evenings, the birds and wildlife, while still being able to get to the places I need to go; being keen on walking and camping but unable to drive I never thought I would be able to live in the countryside due to access and cost issues.

I live in a narrow road which currently has a fence at the end and opens out onto the field, children use the turning at the end of the road to play as the traffic is fairly low and as it is only used by the residents of the road it is fairly safe.

If a new development is built I can see Peveril Drive becoming an access road to it with cars coming and going at all times of the day and night with increased noise and danger to children and other residents. Our quiet neighbourhood and sense of community which are a rarity in these modern times all gone due to the local council desire to please central government by meeting housing quotas and the Sompting Estate greed by selling as much land as they can for development.

Sompting is very unique location close enough for access to both Worthing and Lancing but still retaining its village feel and character.

The building of more homes on any large scale in this location would be totally wrong.

The building on Greenfield sites when there are more suitable brownfield sites in locations in the Adur district should be prohibited. Once destroyed you cannot get the wildlife back.

Policy number 6 states that the Cokeham Brooks site of nature conservation should be safeguarded and protected but if the current development plans go ahead part of the access onto this site will be destroyed and due to increased traffic and environmental pollution put the site at risk from plastic and other rubbish being dumped close to it and increases human interaction with wild species.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 36

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Regarding the proposed building of 1000 or more new houses in the Sompting and Lancing area.

Apart from the obvious problems of buildings on flood plains in Lancing the additional traffic into Grinstead and the roundabout to the A27, which is already a real problem will magnify. The queues of cars from Worthing and Brighton are continuous, trying to join this junction from North or South at the moment is hazardous and will of-course become even worse when the footballs cars join the queue.

The proposed houses on green fields in Sompting would create an even bigger problem with traffic in West Street and the ( already notorious ) hold - ups on the A27. This lane is already a well known rat run from the main road. What happened to the long ago proposed road into East Worthing?

Over 1000 new houses, with lots of families having two - or - more cars will mean the worst part of 2000 cars choking our roads.

Please oppose this madness.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 50

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The current road infrastructure is totally unable to cope with the current flow and volume of traffic. I live in a property that adjoins West Street in Sompting and so know this for a fact. Emergency services struggle to access homes along West Street and into Sompting Village. The plan has an access point on to West Street and Loose Lane for the new development - this would mean even more traffic joining into roads that can't cope with the current amount of traffic.

Flooding - the underground streams in the Church Lane area constantly over flow onto the road now especially after heavy rain and the road is already full of pot holes that have not been properly mended for more than a year. Why would the Planning Department allow or even consider building new houses in area that floods regularly. I appreciate that you can make new houses flood proof, and create under ground holding tanks but this cannot be done retrospectively for current housing stock - where there would be significant increased risk of flooding and this would impact directly on us and affect future building insurance.

Schools in the area are already full and both primary and secondary level, building a new school in Lancing would not solve the issue for pupils at primary level - they would never get to school on time due to traffic congestion!

Hospital and other medical services are already stretched to breaking point and do not have the capacity to take on more patient without significant expansion.

Wildlife - once you disturb a habitat you never get it back.

Sompting would merge with Worthing and lose it's identity as a Village.

Why are brown field sites not being considered first before building on green belt land -

Sompting is surrounded by beautiful countryside, farmland and situated in a National Park - why are the Adur Council allowing central government to dictate local planning policy

The plan talks about affordable housing - but this will not address the social housing need for people on the housing waiting list with council - these houses are aimed at people who qualify for a mortgage and can buy their own houses.

What is in this for Sompting residents - nothing meaningful that I can see - a wildlife area big deal.

Please make sure my objections are included with the other Sompting residents.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 588

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Sompting cannot support a development of this size!

It is crazy. Sompting is very congested at the moment. Other issues like the drains need to be tackled.

If you lived in Sompting, you would understand.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 55

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Sompting Village is a nightmare to live in already, cars use it a rat race when A27 is busy (most of the time).  
Roads are not wide enough and traffic doesn't flow efficiently at the moment without a potential 1500 more cars from new houses.  
Emergency services can't get through the village.  
Road flood, drains block and overflow every time it rains.  
Lack of pavements and safe walking facilities for most of the village and beyond.  
Not enough schools, doctors, dentists and amenities for the people already here.  
Buses struggle to pass each other often having to mount the "so called pavements"  
THE LIST IS ENDLESS

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 587

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

No houses are wanted.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 56

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Flooding already present in village when it rains, more houses would add to this.

Real concern over amount of traffic using West Street already. More cars would not be sustainable.

Not enough infrastructure to support more housing.

No more traffic calming PLEASE!!!

My husband has to go and unblock the road regularly when West Street becomes a car park as no body will give way.

Not a safe option for getting cars out of proposal site for housing.

Village has few amenities as it without a possible 2000 more people coming and going.

AND THE LIST GOES ON AND ON

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 586

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Extra comments:

No more houses!! All points exactly right - traffic congested and is already terrible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 31

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Adding any further developments to the North and South of West Street Sompting will only add more chaos to the already existing problems with traffic.

1. West Street is already a nightmare in the rushhour with traffic at a 'standstill' as is the A27.
  2. Our fear is emergency vehicles will not be able to get through, because of the congestion.
  3. Strategic strip should stay a gap to stop urban sprawl. Birds and wildlife need consideration.
  4. Should houses be built on ground that floods causing possible flooding to our houses - its all a worry!!
  5. The school in Sompting as already full and a new school in Lancing is not viable for a child living in Sompting!!! With the proposal of 400+ houses it does not make a sense.
  6. Sompting residents and children have their everyday life affected because of the congestion on West Street!
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 72

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 539

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 538

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 537

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 70

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 536

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 535

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) 480 houses = 1,000+ people into the communities' already overstretched facilities (doctors, schools etc).
  - 2) 480 houses = 500+ cars onto already congested roads.
  - 3) Irreparable damage to the environment, wildlife etc.
  - 4) Owners of the land offered it for development; thus making a profit for themselves at the expense of the residents. Showing a clear disregard for Sompting.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 534

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 533

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 530

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing in reference to the proposed local plan for Sompting Village. We oppose the plan fully, I am born and bred, and my family also of Sompting. We feel the village would be at risk of flood, so adding 400+ houses would put more pressure to this. The local schools are over-stretched as it is, so this would have an adverse effect forcing locals to enrol their children in schools further afield, which would then put pressure on the bus and train services.

Doctor surgeries would be under pressure and would result in locals going to A&E which is also under duress.

Traffic congestion is bad enough in West Street, with drivers using it as a cut through. At rush hour this causes major grid locks, and also instigates road rage, where drivers get irate. This also affects the buses as West Street is a bus route.

Sompting is a very tight, close community. The thought of 400+ houses would put pressure on this, causing distress and alarm to residents, especially the older generation.

I feel that Sompting would be far worse off with this plan; the crime rate would also increase.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 529

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 566

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 525

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 542

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.

2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.

3) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.

4) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

5) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

6) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 73

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 452

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 522

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We have great concerns for our wild life as this needs to be protected for all our futures. Furthermore, the A27 & A259 is very congested now and will be on the run up to Christmas. Therefore, if we allow the proposed plan to go ahead, this is what it will be like everyday, so no one will be moving at all. We also need these open spaces to save us from flooding, which is a problem in this area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 457

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 520

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 77

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Sompting Green Gap is the only natural land separating Sompting from Worthing. Building on this land would take away village and turn it into a town. Destroy important natural habitats, roads not capable of any more traffic, schools? West Street is a country lane any ways at a stand. Twice a day this would become impossible, Loose Lane a school route would become hazardous, community orchard for what and who's benefit? Travelling site on an area with an abundance of natural animals which they would hunt with their dogs, shoot etc.. And a cycle route to the industrial estate past dump very silly idea. Then how long until roads. Then no longer Sompting just an extension of Worthing. Bad bad plans Adur.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 78

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The traffic in West Street, Sompting is already terrible. How will the roads cope with the increased traffic? South of Loose Lane in a flood area - how can homes be built on the Brooks?

Schools and doctors cannot cope now. Are these new homes will be a terrible strain on the infrastructure. We will just become part of one huge, suburban sprawl with no structure gap.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 519

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 79

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Given the government directive that we must build more houses in Sompting I think the Council have come up with a reasonable plan building 480 houses West of Dankton Lane. My concerns are for the infrastructure to support extra people (water, sewage, schools, doctors, police etc..). The erroson of the Gap between Worthing and Sompting. The effect on wildlife on the proposed site and what if they want more houses that the 480 in the future.

But the biggest concern is the A27 which is at times grid locked from Lyons Farm to Dankton Lane now without the extra housing.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 80

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No facilities for this houses. i.e. Schools, doctors, dentists, etc.. Traffic is horrendous already without adding to it and heaven forbid we'd need the emergency service in a hurry. We can't cope with the traffic now without adding at least a further 1000 cars to the equation get real!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 71

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Stop flood risk - development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning application are going ahead despite residents warning that this will create significant flooding risk. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc.. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 553

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 517

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It seems completely irresponsible and irrational to build a large quantity of houses, maybe on a flood plain, in an area where the A27 grinds to a halt and West Street is a nightmare for traffic and worse so for the residents.

The local school has been partly closed down and presumably would have to be reinstated at a cost; more staff would be needed and again traffic would be clogging up the access roads as working mothers need their cars to get to work. Who is to pay for it?

What about health facilities? The Ball Tree surgery and Worthing Hospital - would they be able to cope with the possibility of another 2,000 odd patients?

What about services, water, sewerage - can Southern Water cope?

There are reports in the local press that the Broadway, West Way etc in South Lancing are suffering the worst flooding yet and the development north of that area is being blamed.

Cokeham and South Sompting and South Lancing due to their topography have always been very wet and it should be borne in mind that the Broadwater once lapped West Street.

If the flood plain is not built on that leaves North Sompting with a highly inadequate road system and no help at all in icy winters and north of West Street, which would involve highly dangerous access in Church Lane or Dankton Lane and either into West Street or the A27.

Finally, what about jobs? Would nearly another 1,000 people be able to find jobs locally and avoid driving miles on the A27?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 563

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 562

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 561

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at a great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps which are so important to wildlife as well as our quality of life are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago, so how can the water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal; not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 69

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

West Street already suffer from extreme congestion and becomes a "car park" during rush hours. Further more, it also becomes a "rat run" and overspill for any problems that occur on the A27. Proposal for this high level of additional housing is madness!! Problems already existent on the A27 and West Street need to be resolved first. The infrastructure does not even begin to support this unacceptable level of property development. If I wanted to live in an "Urban Sprawl" I would live in Brighton or London!! The character of Sompting Village will be completely ruined. Whilst any new properties may be its some extent protected like risk of flooding to existing properties will be high.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 560

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 559

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The impact this project could have is detrimental in multiple ways. Of particular concern is the further drain on our local NHS; it is nye on impossible to get dr/hospital appointments as it is! This alone along with the extra strain on an already congested traffic route, plus the effect on the wildlife, makes even the mere suggestion completely abhorrent.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 558

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 557

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 556

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 540

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 3) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 4) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 5) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 6) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 554

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 541

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 3) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 4) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 5) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 6) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 552

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 551

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 550

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 549

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 548

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 547

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 546

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Massive damage to wildlife, floodplains, infrastructure and community as a whole!

Big objection!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 545

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 544

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 543

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 565

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 555

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 271

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 216

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 279

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 280

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 278

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 277

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 207

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

This is not for locals, its mostly for Blair & his cohorts, London & rest of the worlds immigrants (BBC & Westminster need stopping) we cannot get jobs as it is, I am sick of these prats wrecking our homeland & making out its all needed.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 275

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 208

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 276

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 209

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 282

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 272

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 284

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 271

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 210

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 211

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 270

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.  
Traffic on West Street will be awful and will ruin any sense of village life
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 212

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 213

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I object on the grounds the proposed West Sompting development of 480 homes:

- Proposed without a solution to the existing roads infrastructure which is already under pressure to cope with existing local usage.
- The plan has not addressed the major A27 issues to the west at Lyons Farm junction and beyond and to the east no indicative proposals explained to North Lancing roundabout.
- Further exacerbation to already overstretched demands on the A27 would occur if the New Monks farm development also gets the go ahead.
- A development of this size cannot be considered until a BYPASS is completed
- Loose Lane was not designed as thoroughfare for the number of vehicular movements this development would create. Further West Street, Busticle Lane and Western Road would encounter similar number of movements and this would affect the residents of these roads with more noise, pollution, restricting parking, access onto road from driveways and pedestrian crossing the road.
- The main egress to and from the A27 is proposed to be the Hill Barn junction. This has already been enhanced and leaves little room to get more vehicles queuing in Busticle Lane which leads to more vehicles held in waiting queues whilst A27 is given priority timing. Further from the east bound A27 Hill Barn junction, for right turners, it quite often builds up with cars starting to queue back now onto the main carriageway creating potentially dangerous situations.
- Will bring more vehicles down onto the A259 which is consistently slow at peak times and generally throughout much of the day.
- The housing development is too large for the area and appears to be fitted in without normal dedicated road infrastructure access which is not the standard for estate planning of this size.
- Although clause 2.78 states - 'the site lies predominantly within Flood Zone 1 with small areas in Flood Zone 2, 3a and 3b. Parts of the site are at risk from surface water flooding, particularly the southernmost part. The site is also susceptible to ground water flooding. The site layout will be expected to direct development away from the area's most at risk and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to reduce all forms of flood risk across the site'. –
- The mitigation measures cover the new development but have not shown consideration to the land surrounding the development. E.g. The clause has not considered what happens to the surrounding land if it can no longer use the developed land as a soak away, thus having the potential for unintended flooding consequences.

In comment:

- I have noted that the properties will be connected to sealed foul sewers to avoid ground flood water ingress but does not as far I can see explain what happens to the slow release of the developments collected surface water. I assume that this collected water still gets fed into the southern water sewer system?
- Further the East Worthing treatment works at times has been overwhelmed at times in the past in backing up sewers into Worthing Hospital and flooding local residents near the works, indicates that it is not able to cope with inclement heavy rain conditions
- Can the sewers and treatment works cope with extra household and 'retained' capacity proposed? The major expansion Adur Local Plan is proposing to add to the works is surely not the only new developments the treatment works will have to plan for. What extra developments will come from Worthing's between now and 2023? This is a concern.
- Though I object to the whole scheme but in consideration for housing need the 80 houses off Dankton Lane maybe viable if there flooding risks can be mitigated as there is an existing road to give it reasonable access.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 268

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to these proposals to build 480 houses in the fields of West Sompting. It is my view that the area cannot cope with the increase in population for the main reasons shown below:

#### Transport

These proposals have insufficient plans to improve the existing roads in the area of which this new development will need direct access too. As a commuter to Worthing in peak rush hour times it can take me on average 25 minutes to travel by car to work (2.5miles) this can increase to 40 to 45 minutes if there is an accident or road works. The A27, Sompting Village West Street, and Western Road/Seafront Road are already at full capacity putting the emergency services at risk as they try to navigate round gridlocked traffic. Public transport in the area is also poor with StageCoach and Compass buses now operating a much reduced service than ever before. In wintery weather the buses are unable to operate at all in the area and this can leave the community reliant on one local small convenience store on the housing estate. The plans show no new provision for any more shops to serve the expanding community.

#### Policing, Healthcare and Schooling

The plans also fail to include any extra funding for policing, healthcare, and schooling. Sompting is often classed as a deprived area with many families living on or below the poverty line with high youth unemployment, and drug dependants leading to anti social behaviour and crime. I know from personal experience, living in this area and working in the Probation Service that policing and healthcare services are already at full capacity. These proposals include housing for at least 30% of new social housing but no mention of extra provision to support some of these most vulnerable people in need of housing. I also understand that the local school would not have the capacity to accommodate the extra children therefore requiring these new local children to travel further afield to attend a school. Children that have to travel further to attend school are more likely to truant leading to anti social behaviour.

#### Flood risk

It is my understanding from the Environment Agency that new houses can be built in a way that prevents flooding but they can not guarantee the same for existing houses and the effect of heavy rain on tarmac where there was once fields for water to drain to. This is especially concerning as the fields on the proposals are very close to designated flood plains as defined by the Environment Agency. Last Winter West Street, Sompting became dangerously flooded and then when the temperatures dropped the flood waters froze to leave treacherous black ice. If this road was to flood more then it would be impassable for a period of time leaving little or no access to the new proposed development from West Street, and creating more pressure on the fragile road infrastructure.

For these reasons listed above, as well as the loss of a conservation area and the irrecoverable damage this will do the village of Sompting, I hope my views will be taken into consideration, and you will agree that my objection is about more than the loss of a pretty view.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 214

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

West Street has become a terrible road to travel along and we have always thought that the access down Church Lane from the A27 should be closed. It is this traffic that is causing such a problem because A27 gets so congested now that drivers think it is easier to use it is short cut, and because of this local traffic has difficulty getting through. Having 480 more houses in this area will be an absolute nightmare, as that will be at least another 600 cars using West Street and the surroundings roads. Also have they thought of the flooding that occurs along West Street when we have rain and the underground springs that flood that area. All the concrete that will be used for roads etc. will just cause an enormous run off of water and add to all the other problems.

We have lived in Sompting for 42 years and for the last 22 years along Western Road. We have notice a huge increase in the amount of lorries and traffic that are now coming down this road and have come to the conclusion that it is because the A27 is so congested drivers are just trying to find the quickest route to get where they want to go whether it be along West Street or down Western Road. We thought there was going to be a road connecting A27 to the East Worthing Industrial Estates but if the housing goes ahead to the South of Loose Lane them it will not be built will it!

If the housing proposals go ahead, the traffic around Sompting will be horrendous and virtually at a standstill.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 166

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 273

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 289

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 198

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 329

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 297

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 199

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 296

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 295

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It is madness that any person would consider building a housing development on this scale in Sompting. Traffic is horrendous in the village at peak times, and on more than one occasion I have had to direct traffic when it ground to a halt. 480 homes will only make this worse. The potential enviromental impact on the wildlife and natural habitats in and around the proposed development would also be devastating should the building go ahead. In short I totally object to this building on this scale.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 200

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 294

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 201

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 293

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 281

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 287

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 266

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 291

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1. The Sompting gap should be kept sacrosanct, as should the green belt between Lancing & Shoreham
  2. One doubts if the infrastructure will be enhanced to support this increased population, i.e. schools, roads, medical facilities, etc. especially sewage
  3. The land for these proposed houses should remain as agricultural land - we import too much food
  4. Risk of flooding from building in flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 292

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 290

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 204

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 288

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 205

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 286

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 285

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 206

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 283

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 203

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 242

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 215

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 226

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 227

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 248

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 228

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 229

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 230

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 247

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 246

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 245

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 249

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 243

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sunnybrae

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 250

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 241

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 231

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 240

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage

INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 232

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 233

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 234

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 238

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 235

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 237

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 236

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 244

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Traffic  
Doctors  
Schools  
etc - will be unable to cope!!!

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 219

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 265

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 264

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 263

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 262

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Flooding? Doctors? Hospitals? Schools? Traffic and roads?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 261

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 217

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 260

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Nightmare due to calming chicane effect, will be even worse with extra houses. I have previously submitted photographs of the flooding of the area. Heavy rain results in the houses, restaurants,pubs, getting flooded as well as the fields.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 259

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 258

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 257

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 225

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 256

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

All the above comments apply. This is madness by living around here, and you will see!!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 197

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 255

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 220

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 254

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 221

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

#### NOTES TO ACCOMMODATE THIS FORM:

Some homes must be built to accommodate local people, but to build on mass is unacceptable. Firstly, traffic can't be controlled. However , it is not the only problem:

1) No heavy vehicles other than for access.

2) Restrict vehicles from the A27 North to South down Dankton Land & Church Lane between 8-10am and 4.30-6.30pm Mondays to Saturdays. This would allow residents free access up or down these two lanes at all times.

3) Are the infrastructures in the area suitable for mass building?

4) Waste soil systems in the village area are old in Dankton and properties near the other proposal site are 50 years old - can they take the extra volume that will be created?

5) Surface water and drainage systems are overflowed. Sompting Village has excess surface water during the winter and the area proposed for building is known to be waterlogged at times.

6) This area often gets drought restrictions. Are the current water suppliers able to supply 480 new homes?

7) Power pylons in the immediate area may restrict areas to build. Is it ever suitable to build near pylons?

8) Can the council cope with the extra volume of rubbish from 480 houses?

9) Sompting has a lack of shops, so residents will have to travel to Lancing or Worthing. Both of these locations have a lack of parking, which is either restricted or at a cost. This will also create extra volumes of traffic.

10) Are there sufficient doctors and surgeries in the area? Can the only local hospital take the extra patients it will receive, bearing in mind that Lancing & Worthing are also proposing new builds?

11) Do we have sufficient fire services and policing to cover the new builds in the Worthing, Lancing and Sompting areas?

12) Schools will require more teachers and extra places for children.

13) Since Lancing and Sompting are joined by their boundaries, the problems are doubled as Lancing are reported to want to build several hundred more houses.

Both villages share a lot of services, e.g.: fire, medical, policing and shops. I feel that 480 houses would overwhelm this area. There could be over 480 cars and at least 1920 more people (based on a 4 person dwelling) to use the limited services. Being in my 80s, I have seen areas from Brighton to Littlehampton become a continual concrete mass. The joining of all areas must be avoided.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 222

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 253

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 223

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 252

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 224

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 251

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 218

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 431

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 388

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 173

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 174

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 175

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 437

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 176

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 436

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Also, Allington Road where we live is a dangerous rat run from A27, an accident waiting to happen!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 435

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 177

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 434

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 438

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 432

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 439

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 430

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 429

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 428

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 427

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 426

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 425

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 424

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

### SOMPTING AGAINST ADUR LOCAL PLAN

25th September 2013 was when I was first aware of the 2013 version of the proposed Adur Local Plan.

Since that date I have done everything I can to keep Sompting aware of the plan too.

The page has advertised by all parties ( that held an open meeting ) and I have personally attended them. As of 11th October I printed off some 400 leaflets ( with another 100 from a friend and then delivered them all to West Sompting till I run out.. ( couldn't afford to do any more ).

I am furious with the Way Adur has under informed everyone...

I wish to object for All the following reasons.

Road infrastructure...cannot handle traffic now.

The wildlife on the gap...just moving them to one side is very unfair.

Can 480 homes really fit there...It is not that large area.

Loss of gap...No matter what has been written this area floods.

No extra primary school...Sompting village primary school too small.

No extra medical facilities...The local dentist is taking no more NHS patients.

No extra shops...who builds 480 homes without a thought for shops?

Is there really a NEED to expand Sompting and are the figures right.

Much is said that actually the numbers required are wrong!

Sewerage removal and water in...capacity levels of Southern water.

Who will pay for the extra water in/out of the area?

Extra policing...Sompting struggles with one PCSO ( occasionally ).

Just how many of these homes will be rentable and what does affordable really mean...

No one can afford to buy without jobs.

Emergency vehicles access...There is too little room and too slow traffic for safe emergency vehicles.

If Sompting brings in more 'newbies' there will be even less cohesion, Sompting has enough problems of its own already...

West Street...the original old Sompting, now both a rat run and a traffic jam...being damage by traffic fumes as well as vehicles clipping the old flint walls...cannot take anymore. West Street again where the water comes UP from under the road turning into an ice rink in the winter ( not mentioned in the plan ). West Street again...used by horses...well it would be if traffic would allow... Sompting is a village that has horses! Public transport...the buses have enough trouble getting cancellations. Oddly someone said that the new build would make public transport better HOW?

Flooding on the gap and the fields. Oddly the power that be disagree with the actual farmer who is much more an expert on flooded fields! Is there really any point in mentioning A27 but I will...Sompting possesses a great parking lot called A27 BUT just suppose the Lancing build goes ahead too. And new roundabout is added it will be a giant 2 way parking lot which will back up western road busticle lane and west street even more than now, the word is gridlock. Sompting cannot be used as a giant housing estate for both Shoreham and Worthing where the residents have nothing whilst watching fortunes spent elsewhere on shopping centres..etc. One of Sompting greatest needs is for somewhere to put Sompting Community Church, A building big enough to serve the community the way churches used to.. Oh but there is no space except for houses! Oh and no one seems to mention the travellers site..Sompting does not need it nor can accommodate it..

So to summarise quickly...For so many reasons stated I have said NO NO and NO to this development and I hope this letter makes this abundantly

clear to Adur District Council.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting Reference No. 423

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Sompting does not have the roads or facilities for this amount of dwellings. If we do have these homes please make it affordable for the first time buyers because our children cannot afford the properties in this area maybe some part buy scams.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting Reference No. 178

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 274

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 433

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 446

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 162

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 163

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 455

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 164

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 165

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 454

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 453

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 450

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 449

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 448

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 172

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 447

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 421

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposed housing of 480 homes in West Sompting would lead to such an increase in population that would put an unacceptable strain on already overstretched local infrastructure, especially roads. The A27 has daily gridlocks and severe congestion this will only become worse, the Plans do not make any viable suggestions as to how to deal with the extra congestion. The roads in this area are already at maximum saturation. The plans would place an unacceptable burden on schools, health, police services.

In additional it would increase the risk of flooding, already a big local problem, denying reliable run off for rain water there by increasing the risk of flooding of existing houses. The environmental impact to local wildlife and flora should also be considered.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 445

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs + Dankton Lane.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

This plan have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties - there will be an unacceptable loss of privacy and outlook.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 444

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

The impact on adjacent properties is unacceptable - this includes loss of outlook and privacy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 169

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 170

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 443

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 442

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 441

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 171

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 440

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 167

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 394

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 186

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 400

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 187

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 399

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 398

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 397

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 396

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 188

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 189

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 395

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 422

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposed housing in West Sompting would lead to such an increase in population that would put an unacceptable strain on already overstretched local infrastructure, especially roads ( for which the plan makes no viable suggestions ), but also schools, health and police services. In additional it would increase the risk of flooding, already a big local problem, denying reliable run off for rain water.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 191

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 402

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 192

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 193

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 393

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 392

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 391

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 390

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 194

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 195

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 196

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 456

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 190

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 409

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 389

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 180

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 419

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 418

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 417

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 416

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 415

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 414

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 413

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 412

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 401

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Sompting is for the majority, an area of social and economic deprivation. Those who object to the proposal planning developments for housing are in affect depriving existing and future families in the area from achieving a better standard of living. Places change over time. The 'Rat Runs' won't be rat runs if there are other access roads and improvements to existing roads leading to and from the A27 to Worthing. Population increase and higher life expectancy make the need for bulding previous undeveloped land inevitable. Anyone who has children or is living into retirement has contributed to the increase in the number of individuals on the planet. It is unreasonable to expect an area to remain the same in tight of this. Change is good and should be embraced. Think to future generations - no one is proposing the demolition of historic sites, just that the new is incorporated into the old - look at London, Green Spaces, history and modernism. It's just that on a micro scale. Re Flood plains; they can be built on, just put in basement (eg. Worthing Hospital).

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 410

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 185

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 181

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 408

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 407

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 406

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 182

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 405

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 183

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 404

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 184

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 403

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

I do fully understand that Adur & Worthing Council do need to present a plan for future housing requirements. However, I do not feel they have explained all the current brownfield sites that could possibly be utilised for redevelopment such as the small industrial site is Rectory Farm Gardens that has only just had occupants arrive after years of being empty.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 179

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 411

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I write to advise that I am deeply concerned about the proposed West Sompting development of 480 homes that has been included in the Adur Local Plan. My concerns are twofold firstly that the proposals put forward have been made without a solution to the existing roads infrastructure which we know is already under pressure to cope with existing local usage therefore suggest that a development of this size cannot be considered until a BYPASS is completed. Secondly is the proposed development area is on part of a flood plain and also the vicinity of an SNCI site. Finally with regard to the other plan proposed the problems with the A27 would be further exacerbated if the 400-600 homes development were to go ahead. I have listed the points below starting from the West Sompting housing development:

- The development is too large for the area and village. It appears to be fitted in without normal dedicated road infrastructure access, which I believe is not the standard for estates planned of this size.
- Loose Lane was not designed as a throughfare for the magnitude of vehicular movements this development will create. It will adversely affect the quiet nature and street parking the residents currently have and, needless to say, children's safety in and out of school.
- West Street, Busticle Lane and Western Road would encounter similar number of movements and this would affect the residents of these roads with more noise, pollution, restricting their parking, their access onto the road from driveways and pedestrians crossing the road
- To emphasise Sompting retains its village feel by the lack of parking restrictions, (yellow lines and no parking signs), this development it seems will lead to inevitable parking restrictions, traffic management and loss of residential street parking.
- The main egress to and from the A27 is proposed to be the Hill Barn junction. This has already been enhanced and leaves little room to get more vehicles queuing in Busticle Lane which leads to more congestion with vehicles held in waiting queues whilst A27 is given timing priority.
- Further for right turners at the east bound A27 Hill Barn junction their cars quite often back up onto the main carriageway which already creates potential for dangerous situations. .
- The plan has not addressed the major A27 issues to the west at Lyons Farm junction and beyond and to the east only indicative proposals to address North Lancing roundabout. The statement 'indicative proposals' does not provide any reassurance that traffic flow will be measurably improved. It suggests that only minor changes can be made to the roundabout and approaching roads.
- It will inevitably bring more vehicles down Western Road and queue to get on the A259 which is consistently slow at peak times in both directions and is generally throughout much of the day.
- Further exacerbation to already overstretched demands on the A27 would occur if the New Monks farm development also gets the go ahead. It seems to me to be illogical not to have had forethought regarding the implications to existing road infrastructure and the impact to the lives of many of the residents of Lancing.

(2) The West Sompting development proposal.

Quoting from the plan although clause 2.78 for West Sompting states - 'the site lies predominantly within Flood Zone 1 with small areas in Flood Zone 2, 3a and 3b. Parts of the site are at risk from surface water flooding, particularly the southernmost part. The site is also susceptible to ground water flooding. The site layout will be expected to direct development away from the area's most at risk and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to reduce all forms of flood risk across the site'. –

The mitigation measures, I understand cover the new development but, have not shown consideration to the land surrounding the development. E.g. the clause has not considered what happens to the surrounding land to the development if the surrounding land can no longer use the developed land to absorb ground or surface water, it follows that there is potential for unintended flooding consequences.

The development is proposed to be in the area of Cokeham Brooks which has been designated as an area of SNCI. This close by development will surely affect indigenous wildlife and migrating birds not only during construction but the loss of or potential excesses of groundwater and the wider flood plain area is likely to adversely affect the habitat of the brooks.

West Sussex has to make provision for traveller's temporary site and the Local Plan states Adur should consider this in the plan. It seems an absurd suggestion to consider one in Adur area where space is at a premium and Adur has difficulty finding land to house people on its own waiting lists.

In comment:

I have noted that the properties will be connected to sealed foul sewers to avoid ground flood water ingress but does not as far I can see explain what happens to the slow release of the developments collected surface water. I assume that this collected water still gets fed into the Southern Water sewer system?

If that is so we know that the East Worthing treatment works has at times has been overwhelmed and in the past backing up sewers into Worthing Hospital and flooding local residents near the works. This indicates that it is not able to cope with inclement heavy rain conditions let alone future developments of this magnitude.

These events put in question whether the sewers and treatment works can cope with extra household and 'retained' capacity proposed? The major expansion Adur Local Plan is proposing to add to the works is surely not the only new developments the treatment works will have to plan for. In this regard the plan does not mention if or what extra developments will come from Worthing's between now and 2031. This is a concern with the plan put forward.

In mitigation to housing needs although I object to the whole scheme the 80 houses off Dankton Lane should be able to get reasonable access via the Lane So this part of development maybe a viable consideration if flooding risks can be alleviated.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 783

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Development too large for Sompting. No allocation needed for travellers. Money needs to be spent in Sompting urgently, community orchard wasted? It will be vandalised, not appreciated. Traffic chaos unable to cope even with new road.

I totally object to these proposals. This is a busy area even now West street is usually congested at the best of times. I note additional alterations will be made to roads but feel this will not help. Schools, health centre not adequate to accommodate increase of numbers.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 857

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the application for 480 houses in Sompting being built.

Worthing needs a bypass before any more houses are built in an area where the village is used as a rat run, this needs to be addressed before any more houses are considered.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 856

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

### Objections for the proposed developments

My objections for the proposed developments of the Lancing, Sompting area are based on the quality of life for the present and future residents of any new developments.

Today the traffic congestion, in and around the area, is some of the worst in the country. Travelling to and from work, on any day when there isn't an accident or road works, is bad enough without the additional traffic and saturation of a possible thousand new vehicles in and around the development of Lancing and Sompting.

At present, the whole of the south coast is just one large, over-developed conurbation, with very little natural green spaces between; building on the few green spaces left should be prohibited.

It is realised by most people that there is a need for more "affordable housing" however more consideration to the location of such proposed developments should be given greater consideration. Using brown sites instead of taking more green sites away should be the priority.

As a volunteer ambulance car driver, I am very aware just how over stretched the NHS has become. I take patients from the whole of West Sussex to Brighton or Haywards Heath for their treatments because Worthing, Shoreham or Chichester NHS Trust cannot provide for them, which is distressing enough, without adding to the problems of additional traffic.

A dialysis patient typically needs a four hour session three times a week. If you live West of Worthing and travel three times a week to Brighton, and it takes hours to be transported to and from the hospital, it becomes a wretched form of existence. Please don't make it any worse!

It's a similar case for cancer patients, who must travel to Brighton for radio-therapy because Worthing and other hospitals, which are part of the same trust, are unable to provide appropriate treatment. The frustration and stress already endured by these unfortunate people will be exasperated with further congestion.

As a final and salient point, the council must have noticed that there are only west or east traffic main highways into and out of Worthing, Sompting and Lancing areas. The absence of north or south roads makes the area a geographical bottle neck of traffic, which at specific times of the day, consistently throughout the year, maintains a state of grid lock for the whole area.

How might anything up to one thousand extra cars propose to alleviate this problem or enhance the quality of life for the present or future residents of your voters?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 855

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We say a definite NO to this policy for the various reasons of there is not enough general facilities like doctors schools play areas and also would be far more traffic congestion especially on the side roads that are already in need of road repairs that is not happening and all the extra traffic will make it worse.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 852

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Highways and Access – Sompting is already swamped with traffic at peak times weekdays, and good chunks of the weekend due to drivers trying to bypass congestion on the A27. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are especially bad, and drivers using this cut through are quite often in such a rush to 'beat the traffic' that they drive at speed where possible through the residential areas, until they meet the gridlock that is the area around the Gardeners Arms. This daily occurrence already highlights the inadequacy of the traffic flow in the area, not just in Sompting Village but along this stretch of the A27 in general, and contributing extra 'legitimate' traffic to this area will only exacerbate the issue. It also creates other traffic issues that do not exist yet – if the road entering/exiting onto Dankton Lane is approved, then all traffic heading east / south east has Rectory Farm Road as the most direct route. This road is completely unsuitable for the extra traffic this development will generate – as it is most of the road is single lane due to resident parking, how can the extra traffic not cause both a major problem for existing residents, but also a greater hazard for those families living along the road.

Loss of conservation area – Since the mid 1970s, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a conservation area.

Precedent – A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011) due to the adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 851

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Adur and Worthing Councils

I am writing to lodge my objections to "The Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013".

My objections and concerns for future developments are as follows:-

1)A Precedent has already been set-

A previous Planning Application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector on ( Feb 2011), a) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and b)the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village.

2)Highways and Access-

Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are already notorious "rat-runs" for traffic , mainly heading west off the A27 dual carriageway or using these "rat-runs" instead of the congested A27 dual carriage.

Increased Traffic Hazards-

The vehicles which would exit this residential development would have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, which I understand to be presently over 800 cars per hour.

Parking-

The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs. There is already congestion to moving traffic caused by the existing number of vehicles parked.

Loss of Conservation Area-

Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation area. More building and development would have an adverse effect on the existing wild life.

Reduced Strategic Gap-

This proposed development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community

Village Life-

This proposed development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life. 480 new dwelling would very significantly increase the population of the village itself, especially building house on a know flood plain. I am aware that any future development would be built in such a way to store excess rain fall and pump it away gradually, but this would not help the present flood problems and would still increase risk of flooding in the existing areas of development.

Thank you

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting Reference No. 850

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Comments relate to Map/Paragraph/Policy Number: West Sompting: Strategic Allocation Para's 2.67 onward  
I Object

- Precedent

A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2. the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

- Highways and Access

Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.

- Increased Traffic Hazards

Vehicles exiting this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

- Parking

The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely effect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street environs.

- Loss of Conservation Area

Since the mid 1970's West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a conservation area.

- Reduced Strategic Gap

This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

- Village Life

This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a know flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 859

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 845

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

To whom it may concern,

I would like to express my view on the new houses they are proposing to build in Sompting. (End of Loose Lane)

My husband and I whole heartedly object to the plans. Can I just ask, do any of the powers that be proposing these plans actually live in Sompting? Because we do and for the last 10 years have seen the effect traffic has had on our village on a day to day basis!! We live on West Street, right on the roundabout junction with Church Lane. Every single day I see traffic filtering off the main A27, using our village as a rat run. The amount of road rage, near miss, gridlocked incidences are ridiculous. We have trouble leaving or entering our own drive. We have grave concerns when walking our children and dogs along West Street with the amount of cars that speed along that road at times to beat the traffic. This will only increase and the gridlock will cause untold problems. I have already witnessed numerous accidents on that mini roundabout and I fear this will increase aswell. Thats not to mention the traffic around the school which will also have a major impact and increase the fear of our children's safety.

The road around the roundabout (junc with Church Lane) was an absolute shambles last year. The natural spring was flowing out of the road due to the amount of traffic that was repeatedly going over it breaking it all up and causing huge pot holes. They kept trying to repair it which was a complete waste of time. I actually witnessed a motorcyclists come off his bike due to the pot holes filling with water and being invisible to drivers. How will more traffic make this situation any better?

I have concerns about "village life". The reason we moved here was for exactly that "village life" lifestyle, why should that be taken away from us, what effect will that have on our house prices?! The loss of conservation area, the reduced strategic gap, the parking, the increased population and increased amount of children in the area will all impact our lives significantly. I for one will fight to not let that happen. I want our children to grow up in a safe and village environment. I have a right to give them that. If I wanted us to live in a built up area, we would have moved there!!

Thanks for listening

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 860

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 842

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having just read about the development plans for Sompting, I can't believe the proposal for 80 new houses to be built at the West side of Dankton Lane and beyond.

Knowing what traffic chaos already occurs in Sompting, and in particular Dankton Lane (where I live) when the A27 is busy, this proposal is frightening.

Sompting will become just a congested extension of Lancing/Worthing and will altogether lose its village identity.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 134

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 141

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 142

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Keep the village as it is now. No more houses.

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 143

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 146

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 147

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 836

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to protest against the proposed plans for 480 houses in Sompting Village, I feel that the amount of traffic caused by the new houses will make more considerable havoc on West Street,

We already have a nightmare situation with more and more traffic cutting down from the A27 using Dankton Lane & Church Lane to access West Street, because of the amount of traffic stuck on the A27.

Until a new Motorway over/under the new Southdowns National Park is sorted out then our busy West St will be in a gridlocked situation. We are a VILLAGE not an URBAN area.

Until recent years we have not had pavements in West St and even now the stretch of road from Lambleys Lane to the Templars still has not got a Pavement.

West St is very narrow and the speed limit has no consequence to some Motorists as they travel well in excess of 30mph.

So please do what is right for the Village and West St and STOP these HOUSES being built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 849

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the strategic allocation paras 2.67 onwards.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 871

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We totally OBJECT to the proposed plans for 400 new homes to be built in SOMPTING VILLAGE ON ALL GROUNDS. Especially the traffic it will generate in this area which is already has it's traffic problems.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 880

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With regards to housing developments planned for green gaps at Monks Farm and Sompting I would like to object to these proposals given due consideration to the following points:

### 1) Flooding

Already a significant issue in the area, the development of land that is already at high risk of flooding seems to be a severely flawed plan. Being resident in the area, I have seen works being carried out to try to solve the flooding problem so it is clear that it is already a known issue. While those already in the flood risk areas have (and have had) to deal with these issues it seems incomprehensible that future residents of the proposed site would purchase a property that would more than likely flood leaving them in a property they are unable to insure or sell in future.

### 2) Traffic and congestion

Again, already a very busy area around the Lancing Manor roundabout where it joins the A27, through Sompting all the way through to Lyons farm at Worthing and beyond, the substantial increase in traffic that would result from these developments would severely affect residents already living in the area such as us. It is already a noticeable problem and the addition of two developed sites would just put a strain on roads, which are already overcrowded in this area.

### 3) Over-subscription of schools

With two sites already developed along West Lane in Lancing, there is already an oversubscription to local schools. Having two more developed sites would impact on admissions at these schools even further, potentially forcing local residents (i.e. us and other families with young children) to have to send their children to schools further afield due to a callous overdevelopment of the area.

In overall terms, the combination of these points raised above shows a definitive reason as to why the developments should not go ahead in anywhere near the volume they are planned. It would be a strain on an already troubled flood risk area, inflame traffic and congestion in and around the local area for residents and would be an unnecessary development on valuable green space.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 879

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With regards to housing developments planned for green gaps at Monks Farm and Sompting I would like to object to these proposals given due consideration to the following points:

### 1) Flooding

Already a significant issue in the area, the development of land that is already at high risk of flooding seems to be a severely flawed plan. Being resident in the area, I have seen works being carried out to try to solve the flooding problem so it is clear that it is already a known issue. While those already in the flood risk areas have (and have had) to deal with these issues it seems incomprehensible that future residents of the proposed site would purchase a property that would more than likely flood leaving them in a property they are unable to insure or sell in future.

### 2) Traffic and congestion

Again, already a very busy area around the Lancing Manor roundabout where it joins the A27, through Sompting all the way through to Lyons farm at Worthing and beyond, the substantial increase in traffic that would result from these developments would severely affect residents already living in the area such as us. It is already a noticeable problem and the addition of two developed sites would just put a strain on roads, which are already overcrowded in this area.

### 3) Over-subscription of schools

With two sites already developed along West Lane in Lancing, there is already an oversubscription to local schools. Having two more developed sites would impact on admissions at these schools even further, potentially forcing local residents (i.e. us and other families with young children) to have to send their children to schools further afield due to a callous overdevelopment of the area.

In overall terms, the combination of these points raised above shows a definitive reason as to why the developments should not go ahead in anywhere near the volume they are planned. It would be a strain on an already troubled flood risk area, inflame traffic and congestion in and around the local area for residents and would be an unnecessary development on valuable green space.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 878

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find my comments below:-

My particular objections to the latest plan for Lancing and Sompting are:-

1. The sheer scale: The number of new houses proposed are grossly disproportionate to the size and character of the existing area.
2. Room for expansion in the areas proposed is particularly restricted; by the coastline to the south, the close proximity of the South Downs to the north, and the airfield to the east.
3. The field to the west of Dankton Lane forms a large part of the "green corridor" between the Downs and the coast. This is an invaluable habitat and access route for wildlife, and provides separation between Lancing and Sompting, maintaining the rural character of Sompting village.
4. Local schools don't presently have the spare capacity for the extra numbers of pupils that this huge number of new houses will provide.
5. Last but not least, the east – west road system is already beyond any reasonable limit of its capacity. The west-going traffic on the A27 tails back from Hill Barn traffic lights all the way to the Shoreham flyover between about 5.00 to 7.00 pm on weekdays, and eastbound traffic is crawling all the way through Worthing. The extra traffic generated by this proposed plan and any extra junctions or roundabouts will both severely exacerbate traffic congestion.

The A259 coast road and West Street through Sompting are the only other (badly restricted) alternatives and are similarly clogged at peak times.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 130

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes reference in draft Policy 6: Land at West Sompting to:

- (i) a landscape strategy / green infrastructure strategy, and
  - (ii) that the location and layout of built development, green infrastructure and other landscaping will be based on the principles of respecting the landscape of the National Park and the green gap.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 876

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the suggestion of development within Sompting/Lancing especially the comment in the plan of 'It will also be necessary to release the following greenfield sites on the edge of the built up areas to ensure an adequate supply of suitable land for development'. It's terrible that green belt land is going to be used. Sompting/Lancing is a peaceful village town which is surrounded by countryside. We should be preserving this village feel and protecting the beautiful land rather than destroying it with new housing developments. It will ruin the area and cause more problems for the area. Adding more housing developments will put more pressure on the roads, schools, doctors surgeries, jobs and other services.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 875

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1. Loss of some of the strategic green gap between Sompting and Worthing.
  2. Concern that West Sompting may have been included due to pressure/persuasion of landowner & developer
  3. Increase of traffic on Dankton Lane, West Street & Loose Lane. Traffic already at capacity especially in rush hours. A27 at capacity for much of the day. Traffic using Dankton Lane & Church Lane to come off A27 to use West Street as a rat run. Any more traffic calming on West Street will increase the congestion that already occurs.
  4. It is very important to maintain public footpath across field north of Malthouse Close as it provides access for Sompting residents to the church etc north of the A27. It is well used.
  5. Lack of sufficient public transport. Stagecoach service 7 hourly no evening or Sunday service.
  6. Compass travel service 16 hourly no evening or Sunday service. 6 month trial starting from 1/9/2013
  7. Stagecoach service 7a no longer runs
  8. No provision for a school in Sompting 480 houses. Present primary school too small
  9. Adur is unable to access areas north & south due to the national park & the sea exceptional consideration should be given to the total number of housing the district should be required to supply
  10. Why is it necessary to increase housing in Sompting by over 10%. Research shows demand for housing is highest east of the river Adur. Ref. Sompting state of parish final report Oct 2013
  11. Sompting lacks facilities found in other areas of Adur.
  12. Infrastructure cannot cope with large scale housing developments. No mention of improvements to local doctor's surgery to cope with extra 480 houses.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 858

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to sound my objection to the proposed 480 house development in Sompting. The reason for this is that the road infrastructure is unable to cope with the volume of traffic at present and this would further stagnate with such an increase in housing and increase the dangers associated with the West Street rat run.

The summer just past is the first time in many years that a hose pipe ban was not put in force and until these 2 issues in particular have been resolved I would strongly object to such a development.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 873

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 148

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 868

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 867

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear sir,

Having read the revised plan for the building of houses in West Sompting, I cannot believe this is even being considered. We are being told all the time to allocate a place in our gardens to wild life and here you are planning to build over an ideal place for many creatures who are just as entitled to their homes as we are.

I also was very aware that the type of housing has not been specified, it would be interesting to hear which way your minds are going.

I thought builders were being discouraged from building houses on flood plains.... are the council going to insure these houses, if so are our council taxes going to rise in order to pay for this.

Are our schools, doctors, dentists, pharmacies etc so under used that they are able to enlist all the new families. It has been a while since we have been able to see a doctor on the day or even the following day after 'phoning the surgery unless it is a real emergency.

I dread to think what the A27 will be like it is often a nightmare now so how will it cope with another 800 cars at least. The bottom road is just as bad so will have the same problem.

As you can tell from my comments I am very much against this plan and think only an ill informed group of councillors would contemplate such a bad proposal.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 866

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1. West Street cannot accommodate any more traffic.
  2. A27 struggles with current traffic volume
  3.  Precedent – A previous planning application was dismissed by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011) due to the proposed developments adverse effect on the character and appearance of the countryside and the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village.
  4. Loose Lane access would adversely affect the present residents due to increased traffic and the current necessity of having to park their vehicles on the roadside.
  5. Reduction of the strategic gap is detrimental to the amenity of the village community.
  6. Increasing housing of more than 10% will impact on village life.
  7.  Proposed access to the developments i.e. Dankton Lane ,Loose Lane and West Street suffer already from 'rat runs' from traffic heading west on the A27.
  8. Provision will be necessary for new doctors surgery, primary and secondary schools.
  9. Concern over the loss of flora and fauna found in current strategic gaps.
  10. Concern over possible loss over current rights of way.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 865

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The main issues are firstly the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and of the Sompting Conservation Area and secondly, the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through the village.

- Loss of Strategic Gap-This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, separating rural Sompting from surrounding urban areas of Worthing and Lancing ,and if allowed would be contrary to the countryside policies of WSCC and ADC, and prejudicial to the rural identity of Sompting Village

- Traffic Hazard-Vehicles emerging onto West Street from this residential development have no priority over the West Street Traffic, additional vehicles will compound the hazardous traffic situation in West Street

- Highways and Access-Church Lane, Dankton Land and West Street are notorious

Rat Runs for traffic heading west along the A27 dual carriageway ,then leaving the A27 and travelling southwards down Church Lane and Dankton Lane. New access and egress proposals are prejudicial to road safety

- Conservation Area-Since mid-1970's WSCC and ADC have clearly defined the village of Sompting as a Conservation Area and this proposed development is detrimental to the amenity and road safety of the village community

- Over the last 40 years Sompting has increased in terms of housing significantly ,for example; The estate which leads on South of Test Road, St Mary's Close, Street Barn, Malthouse. Properties have been built at top of Halewick Lane . There are properties being built where the Ball Tree Pub stood. Flats have been erected next to Tribes the undertakers. Significant number of flats built on the corner of Cokeham Road and Western Road North, Hamilton Mews. Western Road at one time did not join the A27 to the A259-the heavy traffic along Western Road/Busticle Lane is unacceptable as it stands. Over the last 40 years Sompting has endured an increase of in the region of 800 homes and Sompting therefore have taken their share-more than most. Building more is unacceptable.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 864

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have no idea which Map/Paragraph/Policy number my comments below refer to. My comments are a heartfelt and overall observation.

The A27 and A259 are so often congested with traffic through from Shoreham to Arundel, particularly in the summer months that more housing in this area will greatly add to this major infrastructure problem. Additional population and car use into the area would be a considerable drain on all the emergency services and probably local schools. Regeneration to Lancing is urgently needed, along the lines of Shoreham and updating public transport and roads, before Adur Council should consider more housing being built. Unless the plan includes the house building contractors to provide these before commencing additional houses on such a large scale.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 863

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having attended the meeting at the Lancing Parish hall, we would like to object to the proposed development of the area at the back of the mash barn estate and Sompting for the following reasons.

- The current roadway cannot take the amount of traffic that currently runs through lancing and the manor roundabout is extremely dangerous and difficult to negotiate especially from the North and south of lancing. More development in this area will make this even more of a nightmare than it is already.
  - Flood risk and the fact it is a flood plain make no sense what so ever to build on this area, Having already been effected by the flood disruption we do not want it to be made worse. The environment agency and the planning people all accepted this to be a major problem and it makes no common sense to build in an area like this. Not only could it cause more flood issues in this area but from an insurance point of view any insurance company would be opposed to covering buildings at such risk.
  - We also do not see the need for more industrial units to be built when half of the Churchill industrial estate sits empty with to let signs everywhere.
  - Sompting development will cause more traffic issues where it is used as a rat run anyway and regularly gridlocks during peak times.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 862

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Hi Guys

Please see attached the leaflet as prepared by Save our Sompting Group, The Vicarage, Sompting.

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE Do not allow this to go through without the proper planning and infrastructure in place. Sompting cannot cope with the through traffic at peak times at mo and the schools are fit to bust. What are you thinking? Build the roads, build the schools, build the infrastructure and then build the houses.

DOES THIS NOT MAKE SENSE?

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 861

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 874

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 795

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 804

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 3) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 803

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 802

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 801

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 800

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 799

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 798

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Someone should come and stand at Hamble Road & Test Road between the hours of 8-9am and 3-4pm to see the amount of cars, buses and lorries causing congestion during the school run. It's an accident waiting to happen!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 833

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With regards to the new West Sompting proposal as drafted in the publically available 'local plan 2013' I would like to raise several concerns, and a selection of questions that I feel should be answered.

Having been a resident for over 20 years, I am very concerned about the impact the new proposal will have on the value of my property to date. I will be undertaking an independent property evaluation prior to any planning having been approved, since the addition of affordable housing and the loss of interrupted scenic views to the north of my property will almost definitely devalue my property, I would like to know how the council are going to mitigate the inevitable reduction in market value.

It is not clear from Map 5 where the proposed 80 dwellings will be located in the north section of the proposed location at West Sompting. In addition there appears to be no consideration for any landscape buffering between the new dwellings and the existing houses at Malthouse Close. Will the new dwellings buffer immediately up to the gardens of my property?

A comment in Section 2.80 outlines proposed plans to support traveller accommodation within the proposed area, however gives no specific locations, is this to be in the location of the 80 dwellings to the north of the proposed area? The impact of this proposal is very significant to the village of Sompting and will almost certainly cause a negative impact to an already growing traffic problem, the A27 is already vastly overrun with traffic and the current traffic calming measure in the village are frankly ineffective, the addition of 400 new properties will only add to the issue. It's important that residents have the opportunity to express their concerns and with that I make it very clear that am not a supporter of this proposal and feel very strongly about opposing its approval. I am sure that I am not alone when I say that this proposal will have a very detrimental effect on our village and properties.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 796

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 807

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 794

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

West Street is already a motoring nightmare - at standstill every weekday.

From from extra housing , we must have fewer cars: the road should be made one way.

If ANY new houses were to be built there must be a full capacity relief road south into central/east Worthing from Loose Lane.

Please, please make sure no houses are built unless proper relief roads are built first : even the construction would be affected otherwise.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 793

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 792

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 791

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- Precedent - rising traffic chaos.
- Highways - Sompting is already a rat run.
- Increase in cars - residential and exiting the area.
- Loss of green area - this is a conservation area.
- Loss of strategic gap - essential to prevent Sompting being a residential dormitory area.
- Disastrous effect on wildlife and migration.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 789

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 787

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The construction of a roundabout system to the A27 does not reduce the already near saturation point of traffic to the west of the proposed roundabout. The proposed development of New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport will both create an unacceptable burden on the west bound carriageway and make exiting to both east and west along the A27 from Grinstead Lane at the Manor roundabout almost impossible at busy times as there will be increased traffic and no traffic lights to break the flow. Much of this increased traffic will add to the queues further west when the Sompting traffic will join it, adding to the congestion at Worthing!

Until a suitable bypass or major road improvements are in place none of the New Monks Farm or Sompting developments should be entertained.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 785

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The concerns I have with these plans are as follows:

- Traffic congestion on Dankton Lane and West Street (as already problems with congestion).
- Inadequate infrastructure, schools, doctors etc.
- Will spoil the character of our village.
- The loss of wildlife and green areas.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 784

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposed local plan, which would allow over 400 houses to be built in the Sompting area, will have an effect on its traffic that passes through West Street. There is currently insufficient road capacity to cope with the existing traffic volumes both on the A27 and through the village. During rush hour, West Street becomes gridlocked resulting in traffic chaos as drivers lose patience and do anything to force their way down West Street. The addition of more houses will inevitably increase car usage in the area, exacerbating an already unacceptable situation further. It is then only a question of time before someone is injured as yet another car mounts the pavement because the road cannot cater for the traffic. Many of the current residents' cars have been damaged by passing traffic and this could result in further damage.

Sompting village is already liable to flooding and building on land nearby will surely increase its risk of flooding, which is unacceptable.

Even now, to book to see one's doctor can take two weeks or more, is there funding for a new health centre and for more policing? More homes would result in the reduction in the quality of services for the existing population.

A new school in East Worthing would only mean people travelling through West street to go there.

The countryside will be reduced and Sompting village as a conservation area will be made a nonsense.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 797

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 815

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It will ruin Sompting completely

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 123

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 830

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposed housing in West Sompting would lead to an increase in population that would put an unacceptable strain on already overstretched local infrastructure, especially roads (for which the plan makes no viable suggestions), but also schools, health, fire and police services. In addition it would increase the risk of flooding, already a big local problem, denying valuable run off land for rain water.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Paragraphs 2.69 – 2.76 of the Revised Draft Local Plan identify three significant environmental and infrastructure constraints to the development of land at West Sompting:

- Agricultural land quality: the land is principally in arable use (Grade 2).
- Landscape impact: The Landscape and Ecological Survey of Key Sites Within the Adur District assesses the site as 'having a high visual sensitivity and medium-high overall landscape sensitivity. The site is visible from a number of sensitive viewpoints within the National Park' (paragraph 2.70).
- Access: 'Traffic from this site will have to pass through the congested North Lancing roundabout to travel east on the A27.....West Street experiences traffic problems. (paragraph 2.75).

Agricultural Land Quality: the National Planning Policy Framework states that 'Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality' (paragraph 112). (The Glossary in Annex 2 defines the "best and most versatile agricultural land" as land within grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification). The development of high quality land at West Sompting as proposed in the Revised Draft Local Plan is therefore clearly contrary to the NPPF.

Landscape impact: given the high visual sensitivity and medium-high landscape sensitivity of the proposed development area, CPRE Sussex believes that even with careful design the development of this site would be substantially detrimental to the visual quality and landscape character of the Worthing – Sompting/Lancing Local Green Gap. In addition, the Gap is particularly sensitive because of its relative narrowness. Although the proposed development area would wrap around the existing built-up area of Sompting, it would still encroach into the undeveloped countryside and both physically and perceptually narrow the gap to Worthing. The West Sussex Land Management Guidelines for the Worthing and Adur Fringes identifies 'urban development pressures, especially in the gaps between settlements' and 'closing of open views between settlements' as key sensitivities of this character area.

Access: the A27 is already at overcapacity, with a particular congestion point at the North Lancing roundabout. The Revised Draft Local Plan acknowledges that local road improvements necessitated by the proposed development may adversely affect the historic character of the Sompting Village Conservation Area, and that West Street already experiences traffic problems. The further congestion and other traffic issues associated with the proposed development would not improve local residents' quality of life.

The Sustainability Appraisal notes the potential for conflict with a number of objectives including the historic environment, countryside, pollution and sustainable transport. The policy requirements may "mitigate" these conflicts, but will not overcome them entirely. Given these significant environmental and infrastructure impacts, CPRE Sussex does not see how development at West Sompting can be considered to be "sustainable", given the National Planning Policy Framework's explanation 'to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously' (paragraph 8) and 'Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality of life' (paragraph 9).

Furthermore, the allocation of this site is contrary to one of the Framework's 12 Core Planning Principles set out in paragraph 17 that 'Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework'. CPRE Sussex

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 827

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I appreciate that some additional housing is required in Adur but question the size of the proposed developments. The coastal strip is already very built-up and the number of houses seems disproportionate to the available land, squeezed as it is between the Downs and the sea. We must ensure that existing centres are well utilised and adapted to meet future housing and development requirements before spreading outwards.

The existing 'gaps' give the area identity; they are very important to Adur residents and provide vital corridors for wildlife. The paddocks to the west of Dankton Lane and south of the A27 have already reduced the biodiversity of the area, even though this area of improved grassland is described as of low significance in the plan.

Additional hardstanding will alter the drainage of existing fields, and the course of numerous springs that rise along and around West Street, with associated flooding implications.

The existing infrastructure, including surgeries and roads, is overlooked. Traffic problems on the A27, the A259 and West Street are well documented. Dankton Lane is very narrow and cars frequently completely cut the corner at its juncton with West Street in a dangerous manner. The lack of sufficient parking on new developments leads to additional parking on adjacent lanes, further increasing congestion.

Our house is only 20 feet south of the proposed development in Sompting and the field sits higher than us. I trust that every effort will be made to meet Revised Draft Policy 14: Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm with particular reference to bullet point 4 'Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an acceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including an unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space'.

I accept that development solutions must meet the requirements of all local residents and provide affordable housing and regeneration for the area, but this must be done without obliterating the character of the district. I believe that the proposed number of houses in Sompting and Lancing will significantly compromise the Local Green Gaps and will lead to the loss of identity of settlements contrary to the Spatial Strategy in the Local Plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 822

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

A27 cannot cope with the traffic already using it.

Flood risk - although not as severe as Mash Barn, our garden was under 6" of water last winter. If that huge area is concreted over where will the run off go? Recent summers we have either had or been threatened with hose pipe bans. Can we cope with the demands for extra water needed for drinking, washing. Laundry, sewer disposal, etc.

With extra housing there will be unsuitable levels of demand for doctors, dentists, schools, ambulances and fire engines. Already have difficulty in accessing 'existing properties because of traffic using the road as a rat run.

No jobs available forcing people to commute, therefore yet more traffic. The infrastructure cannot cope.

KEEP THE GAPS.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 821

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Friends of Cokeham Reed Beds

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Wildlife under threat. Very few wildlife corridors left on South Coast. We already get odour from the local sewage works. Will that get worse?

Not enough schools, doctors, dentists and infrastructure insufficient for increased use. Emergency vehicles slowed down by existing traffic and proposed 'improvements' will not improve matters. These strategic gaps were protected by law. Why and when was this removed?

No jobs.

Water supply. Can it cope with increased used?

Traffic already a nightmare - a potential 2000+ cars are enough reason to reject this whole idea. Sort out A27 first & KEEP OUR GAPS.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 819

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP.

DO NOT want this housing to happen, Sompting is a village. All the roads in Sompting and around Sompting are always gridlocked and it is getting worse. Every house now has 2 or 3 cars. We cannot cope now, let alone if this goes through. So a definite NO from me.

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 818

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 805

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 816

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 806

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 814

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 813

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 812

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 811

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 810

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 809

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 808

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 832

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am against the Adur Draft Plan altogether as Sompting cannot take anymore building as:-

1. Sompting is a Village not a suburb of Worthing seeing that it is now Adur & Worthing Councils.
2. West Street is being used as a bypass instead of the A27 (Come and look between 07.00-10.00 16.00-18.00) the SPEED and NOISE of the traffic, people still think they are on the A27. Any problems on the A27 it is nose to tail all the time that there is a problem up there!  
"What is 30mph anymore In West St" it is laughable some motorists think they are still on the A27.  
It won't be long before there is a serious accident on West St.
3. We need a new road (Through/Under the Downs) before the traffic will stop using West St.
4. Access to the new developments is already overloaded i.e. West St, Dankton Lane, Loose Lane. (Dankton Lane & Church Lane should be closed at the North End to stop A27 coming down to West St.
5. There are not enough Schools First/Middle/Senior or Doctors Surgery's.
6. If there are 460 houses being built that will be approx 920 cars to use West St and surrounding roads. 'At least 2 per household'. People in Street Barn park in West St because they only have 1.5 car parking spaces for each house who owns 5 a car!
7. What do the people of Sompting want a 'Community Orchard & Bank' for, that will not take away all the new houses and put the Village back in Sompting?
8. Building on open fields will increase the risk of Flooding in the area.
9. Building Houses on open land will destroy the habitat of birds, wildlife, reptiles, and amphibians.
10. We have lived in the village for the past 45+ years, the traffic has become a nightmare compared to when we first came here and can only get worse with 460 new houses.

Please reject this plan totally.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 817

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 949

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I agree that additional housing is needed, but any developments in Sompting need to be reasonable in size, supported by increases in schools, doctors, etc and more importantly roads.

Once suitable improvements to the roads are made; mainly West Street, Busticle Lane, Western Road, then a small development could be considered.

I would suggest the 80 dwellings in the Sompting north development is approved and agreed, but with the required road improvements.

Development in the Sompting south area should be avoided at all costs due to the infringement of the Worthing/Sompting gap, poor access, over development, flood risk. There is absolutely no way even with significant road improvements that a development of the proposed size can go ahead in this south area without significant risks to the environment, the local facilities and the makeup of Sompting village itself.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 964

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to you to register my strong objection to the building of 480 new homes and all that will bring to the Sompting and Lancing region.

The building of 480 new homes in Sompting will have a damaging effect on the local area. I have only lived in Sompting for a short while and our house backs on to Dankton Lane which makes us very aware of the traffic problems when they happen. Frequently the traffic on the west bound carriageway of the A27 gets backed up due to the bottle neck around the Lyons Farm area, Dankton Lane and the other small lanes are used as a cut through to West Street. Neither of these roads are able to handle a large number of cars who take this detour and the area becomes gridlocked. West Street already has a traffic calming system which only exacerbates the situation and drags out the congestion for longer. By adding to this problem with more residents and inevitably more cars is sheer madness. The infrastructure is not here either.

Sompting does not have enough of the basic needs of schools, health workers, shops or community space for the existing residents, let alone 480 more families. Plus you are planning to house young children under the power lines which have been shown to be unhealthy.

Therefore I must strongly object to these plans and demand they are overturned.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 963

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to you to register my objection to the plans to build 480 homes in Sompting.

I have only lived in Sompting for 18 months but my house backs on to Dankton Lane and this makes me very aware of the traffic problems in the area. Whenever there are any traffic jams on the west bound carriageway of the A27, Dankton Lane is used as a cut through to West Street. Neither of these roads are able to handle the large number of cars who take this detour and the area becomes gridlocked. By adding to this problem with more residents and cars is sheer madness. The infrastructure is not here. Sompting does not have enough basic needs of schools, health workers, shops or community space for the existing residents, let alone 480 more families.

I strongly object to these plans.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 962

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1. 480 homes are not sustainable regarding transport and road infrastructure, schools, doctors, dentists and services, particularly water and sewerage.

2. The Green Gaps should be preserved to prevent the merging and loss of identity of towns and villages. If it is vital to develop strategic gaps this should be done sympathetically and to the minimum amount, i.e. it would not be unreasonable to build a few homes on the back of the existing estate in a ribbon like fashion.

3. Any wildlife that will be disturbed will not return once the development has finished.

4. There is a risk of flooding to existing properties if there is extra concrete and hard standing, like roads, etc.

5. The proposed community orchard is not significant enough to make the development of 480 homes acceptable.

6. The current traffic problems on the A27 and the A259 would be made even worse. The travelling time from Lancing to Worthing during rush hour is unacceptably long and is not attractive to potential visitors to the town.

I would urge ADC to seek to develop brownfield sites everywhere possible and to only develop the strategic gap with a smaller number of homes if absolutely necessary. I would urge ADC to look at building vertically, not just horizontally in areas where this would be sympathetic to the relevant scene.

Presumably, there would need to be more pylons erected, Sompting already has its share of these ugly monsters. Also, presumably, there would be no gas pipes, in the event of a power failure, more people would be vulnerable to risk than there already is. Ideally, there would be no further development in the gap but as it appears that ADC may not have any choice, I would ADC Planners to keep the number of homes developed in this area to the absolute minimum.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 961

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

480 houses in our tiny village will be overpowering.

Too much strain on our community.

Not enough doctors, dentists, schools, shops etc.

Bus service awful now, worse since the college has opened and then the no7 was cut to one an hour.

Train service is stretched already, no seats available.

Houses will be built on flood plains creating possible flooding to existing properties .

Drainage is already a problem, another 1000 people plus is a nightmare.

Wildlife will be affected badly as all their areas are being closed to them.

West Street is already a rat run for the A27 making entrance/exit into this road is madness.

A 5 minute journey takes half an hour at peak times.

Loose Lane also runs into West Street.

Parking will be a problem as new housing only allows parking for one and a half spaces.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 960

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am emailing you in response to the proposed new Adur housing development plans at Monks Farm Lancing & Loose Lane Sompting areas.

I am a resident of Sompting Village & though I welcome the quote on these new plans that "...the character of Sompting village, which lies outside of the Built Up Area Boundary, will be respected and maintained..." , I do have major concerns on the proposal's impact on the ongoing issue of the traffic in West Street, Sompting Village.

West Street is regarded by many as a "rat run" & is used by so many cars, lorries & vans who do not wish to wait in the queue caused by the traffic lights at Lyons Farm. As a resident on West Street for nearly 7 years now, all I have seen is the Council's complete disregard for West Street being part of the "character" you claim to want to "respect & maintain". I am sure the local council & highways agency are unconcerned about this, but as many residents have expressed the opinion before, this is an accident waiting to happen.

I have lost count at the occasions I have witnessed road rage incidents outside our house, caused by motorists ignoring the current calming measures & see a potential new development as a further, huge increase in West Street traffic. Only yesterday, I witnessed one of the 150+ year old flint walls was hit AGAIN by cars ignoring calming measures & trying to pass each other at inappropriate places.

If Local Councils do wish to respect the village, could I propose a 20mph speed limit along West Street & ask for a "Sompting Village" sign to ask motorists to respect the village & drive carefully, at the very least? The traffic problem has become even more apparent now as we have recently had a baby & it is an incredibly dangerous road to cross especially with a buggy. Not to mention that there are 2 schools within the West Street area & how an accident has not yet happened, is a miracle.

The West street traffic issue needs addressing as a matter of urgency, if this development is to be considered.

Furthermore, & again, the issue that the proposed development will be built on an area considered a flood plain appears to have been overlooked. There are not enough schools, shops, public transport (which has been cut AGAIN), green/community space or health workers to cover this new proposal. I assume with a potential new development, all of these concerns have been considered & will be acted upon, or there will be further risk of all of these becoming overstretched further?

Sompting residents do have to pay extra council tax to live here; I do wonder how this money is spent as it doesn't seem to cover the needs of residents, as far as I can tell. This is a lovely area to live, which is constantly under threat by development & continuous traffic problems. The need for green space is as absolute necessity & one of the main reasons for us moving here. It is a real shame that this is not a priority for local councils who seem determined to turn everywhere into housing developments & destroy the natural beauty of conservation areas, & appear to show no concern for the conservation area of Sompting village they claim to "respect & maintain".

Thank you & I do hope you take our concerns into consideration.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 959

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am objecting to the whole plan for Sompting and Lancing as I cannot see how the A259 and A27 could cope with an extra 2000 cars using these roads every day. Until the transport problem has been addressed there should be no major building developments in Adur.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 958

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This plan raises a number of issues with:

- 1) Traffic: The proposal for traffic calming measures will not reduce the current high volume of traffic dropping down off the A27 to rat run through West Street causing huge problems with congestion. Alternative routes through to East Worthing need to be identified.
  - 2) Flooding: Not only does Sompting have issues with water running off the South Downs but with heavy rain the aquifer under the Weald fills up and springs appear along the bottom of the South Downs many surfacing in Sompting.
  - 3) Schools, Doctors, Dentists, Hospitals: These are all currently under pressure with the existing population.
  - 4) Water Supply and Sewage: Is there sufficient capacity to cope with the proposed extra demand.
  - 5) Bus Services: The bus service for West Sompting is poor and will not service the extra demand from this plan.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 50

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The current road infrastructure is totally unable to cope with the current flow and volume of traffic. I live in a property that adjoins West Street in Sompting and so know this for a fact. Emergency services struggle to access homes along West Street and into Sompting Village. The plan has an access point on to West Street and Loose Lane for the new development - this would mean even more traffic joining into roads that can't cope with the current amount of traffic.

Flooding - the underground streams in the Church Lane area constantly over flow onto the road now especially after heavy rain and the road is already full of pot holes that have not been properly mended for more than a year. Why would the Planning Department allow or even consider building new houses in area that floods regularly. I appreciate that you can make new houses food proof, and create under ground holding tanks but this cannot be done retrospectively for current housing stock - where there would be significant increased risk of flooding and this would impact directly on us and affect future building insurance.

Schools in the area are already full and both primary and secondary level, building a new school in Lancing would not solve the issue for pupils at primary level - they would never get to school on time due to traffic congestion!

Hospital and other medical services are already stretched to breaking point and do not have the capacity to take on more patient without significant expansion.

Wildlife - once you disturb a habitat you never get it back.

Sompting would merge with Worthing and lose it's identity as a Village.

Why are brown field sites not being considered first before building on green belt land -

Sompting is surrounded by beautiful countryside, farmland and situated in a National Park - why are the Adur Council allowing central government to dictate local planning policy

The plan talks about affordable housing - but this will not address the social housing need for people on the housing waiting list with council - these houses are aimed at people who qualify for a mortgage and can buy their own houses.

What is in this for Sompting residents - nothing meaningful that I can see - a wildlife area big deal.

Please make sure my objections are included with the other Sompting residents.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1047

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

- Traffic congestion - it really is impossible now with West St being used as a rat run - everything will be at a standstill.
- Increase of pollution from extra traffic.
- Sompting will have no green spaces left so no longer a village.
- Strain already on doctors/hospitals/schools - already bad!
- No reliable bus service - No.7 bus has had a greatly reduced timetable already and there is no alternative if you can't drive.
- Extra strain on services, e.g. water supplies.
- Will there be enough policing, fire station/pumps to cope with the extra 1000s of people coming into the area?
- Does the proposed build/plan for 480 homes set a precedent for additional homes to be built later on surrounding land?
- Losing the animals/birds etc on the reed beds and the diverse creatures etc which come to Malthouse Meadows/surrounding fields.
- Flood issues!!!!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1044

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Owls Haven

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I would like to comment on the cancellation of the crossing between Carnforth and Bowness. Why should one person be able to object and many, many people are desperate for a safe crossing to the shops be penalised?

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

- I am shocked and extremely concerned at the proposed allocation of over 1000 new homes in West Sompting. Sompting is currently overwhelmed by horrendous traffic issues, particularly during the rush hours along West Street. In an attempt to avoid the frequent one-mile long west-bound traffic jam along the A27 tailing back from Lyons Farm, vehicles constantly cut down from the A27 via Western Road, Dankton Lane or Church Lane onto West Street. Any traffic heading east along West Street then grinds to a halt due to frequent narrow areas of the road where only one car can pass. This subsequently leads to a traffic stand still tailing back along West Street, running from Lyons Farm to Loose Lane. Now, let's work by the rule that the average household has two cars. Therefore, one-thousand new homes equal two-thousand new cars. How on earth will Sompting cope with this? It's simple. It won't. These plans have been put together by people who have very little knowledge or understanding of the current traffic issues faced by residents of Sompting. Instead of proposing developments for new homes, we should be looking for a way to solve the traffic issues currently faced. Bus journeys are pointless as they are always late. Emergency services have NO chance of effectively using the road should they need to respond to an emergency. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?

- Sompting is a little village between the South Downs and the sea. There is a lot of water around coming from the downs and in from the sea. As a result Sompting frequently floods, particularly during the winter months. In 2012 Bognor Regis flooded. The flooding in North Bersted was the fault of Arun District Council, Barkley Homes and Charles Church, who constructed over 600 houses on flood plains; similar to those proposed in Sompting, which until the construction started had provided a natural form of drainage for this amount of rain. Arun was warned about flooding by local residents and environmental agencies. If the flooding in Sompting becomes a more serious issue than it already is, Adur District Council be solely responsible for the upset and damage to homes that will inevitably be caused. Look at what happened to all of the homes of Lancing residents living south of Lancing Manor Leisure Centre in 2012. We are talking about massive flooding less than one and half miles from the proposed Sompting developments. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?

- In the development plan there appears to be little or no provision for extra policing, extra shops, extra doctor's surgeries, hospitals or even schools to cope with the demand of residents from over one thousand new homes. How is this acceptable? How is Sompting going to cope with this?

- What environmental impact will this development have to all the wildlife that has been on the Sompting gap for hundreds of years and use it as a migration path? How is this acceptable?

- I am disappointed, angered and saddened as it appears that Adur District Council has no idea of the issues we face as residents of Sompting. You should be working to improve our quality of life. What you are proposing suggests you don't care.

- These points highlight my major concerns with this proposed development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 946

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My first reaction to this ludicrous development plan for West Sompting was to think that the person responsible had no knowledge of the area, but having carefully read the Revised Adur Plan I can see that research has taken place, but just the comments in sub paras 2.74 to 2.79 shows the writer is damned by their own hand. All that is missing is to assert there will be no worsening of noise and air pollution! In addition, the comments implying that funding will be found for “ a package of measures including improvements to the A27/Busticle Lane junction, A27 Sompting Bypass/Upper Brighton Road junction and expansion of the traffic calming scheme in West Street” is simply laughable, if it wasn't so serious. The comments contained in the sub paras I have referred to saves me from re-stating them here, but please refer to them as part of my submission. There are a number of reasons to vehemently object to these proposals but I'll concentrate on just one – TRAFFIC! There are 2 proposed exit routes from the proposed 400 houses south of West Street, they are Loose Lane and West Street. Loose Lane feeds in to West Street, so 400 houses occupied are likely to produce 600 or more vehicles feeding directly into West Street. This road through the VILLAGE already has traffic calming measures and has long been referred to as a 'nightmare' for anyone living there. Traffic chaos occurs for part of every day in West Street due to the traffic on the A27 going west desperately seeking an alternative route, while people who live in or need to get to Sompting, attempt to drive west to eat along West Street. You cannot make a dreadful situation worse!

Of the other proposed development below the A27, the proposed exit is into Dankton Lane. This road is already heavily used by A27 traffic trying to avoid the long queues on the A27. People living on the proposed development would either have to use the A27 via Dankton Lane – going west (no alternative), or West Street, the same West Street that is so heavily used now! The whole proposal is utterly ridiculous!

The part of Dankton Lane between the A27 and Dankton Gardens is so narrow that no two vehicles can pass. It is not unusual to see a slow moving long line of traffic in Dankton Lane going south into West Street because of the congestion and delays on the A27. One evening recently an accident occurred near the B&Q Retail Park, this resulted in vehicles becoming bumper to bumper in Dankton Lane, Church Lane, West Street and the A27. The area was completely gridlocked. I had to cancel a meeting I was due to attend in Findon, I could not get out of my layby. Until a by-pass around Worthing is established it is irresponsible to even consider more housing developments that impact adversely on Sompting Village and the A27 route through Worthing.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1048

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Going into Worthing at rush hours is already bad. More homes in this area will make it worse. No more houses without a Worthing bypass.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1049

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Housing is important wherever it may be. However, we must have the roads to cope.

The A27 at Lyons Farm each day is a nightmare. Weekends are ruined by constant queues of traffic.

Worthing needs a by pass. Shoreham has one, Chichester has one, Arundel has one. What makes Worthing/Sompting A27 different? That is without road works - God help us all when they are about!!

Businesses/all kinds suffer due to people being late for work, even though they start out earlier and earlier each day. Come on David Cameron as one of your supporters do me a favour - come and see for yourself please!...

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1050

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

- 1) Environmentally damaging
  - 2) Adding to traffic congestion
  - 3) Overloading the doctors surgery
  - 4) Lack of school places adding to traffic problems
  - 5) Increase risk of flooding
  - 6) Increase in domestic waste
  - 7) Water shortage.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1051

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Yes we do need housing, but not without the roads, schools and doctors to go with it; also a better public transport. We do not need a cycle route, travellers ste or orchard. We also need a bypass or improvements to the biggest car park in the South, namely the A27.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1052

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The A27 traffic and also congestion in West Street is already at a critical level. More houses in this area will increase this difficulty that already no governing body appears capable of rectifying.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 129

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation 10 Whitestyles Road Sompting Lanicng

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

I don't support any of it, it is bad enough now without adding to it, it is about time something was done. We are no mans land as it is, no buses evenings or weekends. Surely something can be done, it seems nobody wants to know. How about it, can you do something about the bus?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 954

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

After reading the plan in whole I cannot believe that anyone would consider this as an acceptable plan for this area. I relate mainly to the plans for Lancing and Sompting. I will try to explain why this proposed plan cannot be allowed to go through. Having lived in Sompting Village for 15 years I have already noticed a big change to the area. The build of new properties in West St a few years ago has already stretched our village to capacity. Local schools, doctors, dentists all complain that they are overfilled and overstretched. I have recently had to use my local doctor, dentist and Worthing hospital. I cannot see how increasing the amount of people living in the area will help in any way. As for my main concern I can't think how anyone knowing this area could not realise what this will do to local traffic and roads. In the big picture, We are, by location, hindered by having the downs just to the north and the sea to the south. With Sompting being the "pinch point" of the traffic problems. With only two roads cover west-east this has been a long term problem. The A27 CANNOT take any more traffic. It already uses Sompting Village as a semi by pass! As a local Driving Instructor, I see how this has affected our local roads including Loose Lane. The addition of Worthing College moving to Grove Lodge has just made a bad situation worse. The state of the roads around West Street nr the entrance to the village itself shows how this area can not take all this traffic. As this is all local bus routes it must hinder the bus service every day. The A27 and West Street can not take the current levels of traffic. This would need to be resolved LONG before anyone could think of adding properties to the Sompting and Lancing area. As for my road, Loose Lane, it is a narrow but already busy road with buses having to "squeeze" through especially at bust times ie rush hours and school times. Adding nearly 500 homes and using Loose Lane as an entrance to this estate has major traffic concerns as well as safety worries with the school nearby.

That states my physical concerns but please also note my emotional worries. When I moved to Sompting, it was mainly decided because of its quiet "village" feel. My sons and I run a local football team called "The Village" It has been a nice place to live without being miles from all we need. Good shops nearby but access to walks and wildlife on our doorstep. The new development around West St has already changed the village feel to the area. With this new proposal, I think we could forget our village status and just consider ourselves an extension of Worthing! WE WANT TO STAY AS A VILLAGE!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1038

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

CONCERNS.

1. Overdevelopment of the central area of village. Reduce the number of dwellings.
2. Are the dwellings really going to be affordable for young people?
3. Major issue is access roads to the development and the A27 at Lyons Farm relationship. Traffic does need to flow on A27, which is not happening now.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 987

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Natural England

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

In relation to the land at West Sompting, it is good to see that site-wide surveys will be carried out to assess what is there. These would be required by Natural England in order to assess the need for mitigation and enhancement and its effectiveness.

Enhancements to the local Sight of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) at Cokeham Brooks are welcomed. Restoration plans and management plans for these areas would be a required part of the development proposals, as stated.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Section 2 of The Plan reads:

2.70 The 'Landscape and Ecological Survey of Key Sites Within the Adur District (2012)' states that the Sompting Fringe area is an exceptionally open arable landscape with an expansive scale and long views. It is assessed as having a high visual sensitivity and medium-high overall landscape sensitivity. The site is visible from a number of sensitive viewpoints within the National Park. As a result, any new development within the Sompting Fringe area must be designed sensitively and the Landscape and Ecological Survey sets out a number of development proposals to minimise the impact of development on the landscape. This includes, amongst other things, a number of tree clump 'islands' to soften the built edge of the development and provide a visual screen at key visually sensitive locations, and off site planting in hedgerows to the west.

2.71 The Landscape and Ecological Survey also assesses the Sompting North area and states that only the south east corner of the site is visible from sensitive viewpoints within the National Park, as it is generally shielded from views from the National Park by the landform on the lower slopes of the Downs. The site is assessed as being of medium landscape sensitivity.

We are in agreement with the conclusions of the Landscape and Ecological Survey report insofar as they affect Sompting. We would propose that single storey buildings should be considered for Sompting Fringe and that they should be of a design which is sympathetic to those in adjacent areas. Similarly, houses in the Sompting North Area may be two-storey but should be built in a similar style to those in the older parts of Sompting.

2.73 There are potential opportunities to open up the countryside between Sompting and Worthing to the public by providing a public footpath/cyclepath east-west to link with the employment areas of Worthing and East Worthing train station. The Teville Stream Restoration Project being promoted by the Environment Agency in partnership with Worthing Borough Council and the landowner, which aims to return the stream back to its natural state, may also provide opportunities to enhance access to the Local Green Gap.

We support the opening up of public access to the Teville stream area. This would partially offset the loss of land to the north and east due to building development.

Consideration should be given to providing a cycle path across this site to east Worthing. Cyclists are likely to prefer dedicated cycle paths spate from pedestrian walkways in the interests of safety.

The results of a survey in which the utility of such a route was raised resulted in a favourable response for both recreational cycling and as an alternative route to work or school. (Paragraphs 3.12 and 3.13 of the Sompting Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031 State of the Parish Report)

2.74 Access to the southern part of site would be via Loose Lane and potentially a new access from West Street which would run along the western boundary of Sompting Fringe, forming a boundary to this part of the development. If this is implemented, it will give priority to traffic going to/ from the development.

2.75 Traffic from this site will have to pass through the congested North Lancing roundabout to travel east on the A27. Potential mitigation measures have been identified and will need to be delivered as part of the development. The A27/ Dankton Lane junction will require further investigation. In addition, any local road improvements affecting Sompting Village Conservation Area must respect its historic character.

2.76 West Street experiences traffic problems, in part caused by westbound traffic 'ratrunning' to bypass congestion on the A27. There is an existing traffic calming scheme on West Street and Upper Brighton Road. However, further traffic management is likely to be required on this route. This is likely to involve extending the traffic calming measures to the east and intensifying existing measures.

2.77 Prior to the submission of any planning application for this site, a full Transport Assessment will be required to look at access onto, and impact on local roads, and off-site impacts on existing junctions along the A27 and will need to demonstrate how the development will deliver the necessary mitigation measures.

The probable impact of traffic is a matter of concern. Western Road, Busticle Lane and the A27 already suffer from considerable congestion at key times of the day. The problems are accurately recorded in the draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2013, Position Statement B. In summary, this Statement says that the current situation is desperate and that no one has any money or plans to do anything about it.

Some funding may become available from the Developers. However, since a large proportion of the new housing is expected to be 'Social Housing', the amount of funding available may be limited. We have doubts as to whether Developer Contributions will be sufficient to allow a significant improvement. (We also note that Developer Contributions are anticipated for expanding the provision of educational facilities. We believe that the Developer is being asked to support too much development out of his pocket).

We note from the Air Quality Action Plans that Grove Lodge roundabout already exceeds allowable levels of nitrogen dioxide. Additional traffic from the new developments may cause additional congestion on the A27 - possibly extending the affected area eastwards towards Sompting. This would be due to traffic being held up at the 'improved' road junctions envisaged to service the new developments (as described in the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan September 2013). We doubt as to whether a transport survey will result in any realistic mitigation measures to counter the increased congestion due to new developments.

2.78 The site lies predominantly within Flood Zone 1 with small areas in Flood Zone 2, 3a and 3b. Parts of the site are at risk from surface water flooding, particularly the southernmost part. The site is also susceptible to ground water flooding. The site layout will be expected to direct development away from the areas most at risk and appropriate mitigation measures will be required to reduce all forms of flood risk across the site. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required at the planning application stage and this will need to show that not only can flood risk be mitigated on site but that flood risk will not be worsened elsewhere. Opportunities to improve flood risk in the area should also be sought where possible.

We note from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment January 2012 Section 4.2.2

The site is partially within Flood Zone 2 and at high risk of groundwater emergence, therefore all development proposals should be accompanied by a FRA. Future development of Sompting Fringe should be mindful of the various sources of flood risk, and where possible implement sequential design throughout the site to try to reduce flood risk within the development.

(...)

However it should be noted that there is a detailed flood risk modelling study being undertaken along the Teville Stream [by the Environment Agency] , and any future development should look to use the outputs from this study to delineate the flood risk to the site.

The effect of climate change should be considered for all new development...No assessment has been made with regards the impact of climate

change on surface water and groundwater flooding.

The site is at risk of surface water and groundwater flooding, therefore steps should be taken to reduce the consequence of flooding, i.e. sequentially plan a development so resilient uses are placed on the ground floor. Any future development should ensure that it would not increase the surface water or groundwater flood risk elsewhere, to achieve this any existing flow paths would need to be maintained. The site is green field so surface water drainage techniques should be built into any new design to ensure runoff does not increase. Also any subterranean development would need to be resilient to groundwater flooding, and not disrupt existing groundwater flow paths.

From Strategic Flood Risk Assessment JBA Consulting 2012, Core Strategy Summary Sheet 9. A similar statement is included in Sheet 10.

A member of Sompting Parish Council has contacted the Environment Agency to obtain information on the latest stage of their detailed report for the Teville Stream area. Sompting Parish Council would recommend that Adur District Council make enquiries and review whether development of 'West Sompting' remains viable in respect of food risk.

Finally, the consultant recommends sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) be used. Given the state of the fields, the Developer will have to shovel a lot of mud to achieve this. Let us hope that he will not ruin the environment in the process.

#### Affordable Housing

We note the allowance for affordable housing. We would wish to draw attention to Sompting Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031 State of the Parish Report paragraph 3.43. This states that most respondents to our questionnaire stated that they did not know of anyone who needed social housing. Although social housing was considered a probable requirement locally, this appears to be a perception rather than a reality.

When asked about their housing needs, most respondents stated semi-detached and bungalows (paragraph 3.45.)

The present tenure is about 15% of broadly defined 'social / affordable' housing. We recommend that any new developments should reflect local felt needs.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 980

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

REVISED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN 2013 FOR ADUR DISTRICT

## STATEMENT BY UK INDEPENDENCE PARTY COUNCILLORS

The Government published a National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012 and made it incumbent on Local Authorities to prepare Local Plans consistent with the principles and policies laid out in the National Plan. At the same time, the Government stated that the NPPF was based on projecting the housing needs for the whole country, and was insistent that the varying circumstances within Local Authorities had to be considered when each Local Authority prepared its own Local Plan.

Adur Council prepared its own draft Local Plan in Autumn 2012 for housing needs up to 2028 and subsequently revised that Plan to relate to a further 5 years, i.e up to 2031. Adur Planning Committee decided that their Local Plan, though driven by the basic purpose of meeting the suggested housing targets set out by the NPPF, should embrace a range of issues associated with new housing, such as employment possibilities, environmental impact, traffic increase, infrastructure needs, such as additional schools, medical facilities, shopping etc, plus the plans already in place for general Regeneration – all these issues were to form a Strong Material Consideration in formulating the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013. This revised draft plan (2013) has now been submitted to Adur residents and local organisations for their views.

We, the undersigned Councillors, have listened carefully to the opinions expressed very strongly at meetings with local residents, and list below a summary of the issues they feel the Planning Committee must take into consideration when finalising the ADUR District Local Plan.

1. The Draft Local Plan is essentially based on a projected housing need of some 3000 dwellings across Adur District for the years up to 2031. These were to be allocated as : 1050 in the Western arm of Shoreham Harbour, up to 600 at New Monks Farm, 480 in West Sompting and 817 “within the built-up area of Adur”. Although the earlier 2012 draft plan had included West Beach (Hasler) in the total housing needed, that area has been excluded from the revised draft plan, meaning that whatever housing had been identified for West Beach must now be absorbed by New Monks Farm/West Sompting.

### 2. THE FLOOD PLAIN.

The issue that without doubt has engendered the strongest feelings locally has been the extraordinary and devastating problems experienced by residents during periods of excessive rainfall. Much of their concern has been attributed to the flood plain levels throughout the locality, with overflowing sewers, flooded homes, flooded roads, etc, Yet this whole matter associated with the flood plain, with all the inevitable suffering inflicted on residents receives scant attention in the Local Plan – a mere 3 lines (Page 16, V9) and one paragraph at the bottom of Page 38 – and this in a document stretching to over 200 pages! The fundamental issue for residents is that if the revised Local Plan is implemented, the additional housing in Lancing and West Sompting would intensify and exacerbate the appalling current realities of flooding – and quite unnecessarily- and all as a result of the Planning Committee’s adherence to National housing targets.

### 3. TRAFFIC CONGESTION.

A further issue of great concern to residents is the suggested building of a new roundabout on the A27 road north of the airport, plus the likely adjustment to the roundabout at the northern end of Grinstead Lane. There are already huge congestion problems in this area, and the additional housing planned will result in even more traffic on all the adjacent areas. When the Brighton Football Club’s Academy becomes fully operational in

2014, the traffic congestion currently experienced at the A27 roundabout and at the Crabtree-Mash Barn Lane junction is bound to be greatly increased.

#### 4. INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES.

The revised Local Plan allocates to the New Monks Farm up to 600 houses over the years leading to 2031, i.e in the region of 140 dwellings per year. But the Plan hardly mentions the fact that the 140 houses planned for New Monks Farm will probably equate to over 400 people. Such a large number of new arrivals will inevitably impact on the facilities currently available to the local residents.

a) More shopping facilities will be needed – there are presently many empty shops in the main Lancing shopping streets, with residents complaining of too many charity shops and not enough “real shops” to satisfy their needs.

b) Residents already have to endure long waits to see a doctor or arrange a hospital appointment – the increase in housing (and therefore more people) will necessitate increased medical facilities to be made available.

c) More housing means more children, so an expansion in either classrooms or new schools will have to be included in a future Local Plan. Provision for such expansion will apply to nursery, primary and secondary educational facilities.

d) More housing means more people, young and old, will need employment, but there is already a lack of employment possibilities in the local area. The Local Plan recognises this problem, but trusts that new employers will come to Lancing and Sompting and be established before the planned newcomers come to inhabit the new houses to be built.

All these developments that will result from the planned housing will require a range of infrastructure features to be available. Many residents do not believe the Planning Committee will allocate to Lancing and Sompting the resources needed.

#### 5. UNDER-USE OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL PREMISES.

The Local Plan envisages developing commercial premises in the area to attract new employers, bringing more trade and investment. Yet there are numerous business sites already existing in the Adur area, many currently under-used. If more sites were developed it would involve more employees coming in from outside the local area, resulting in even more traffic congestion where employees live some distance from their place of employment.

#### 6. FLAWED POPULATION NUMBERS PROJECTED.

One must question the projected housing needs basic to the Local Plan. National predictions based on computer models have been found to be notoriously unreliable, resulting in huge and wasteful expenditure. The Office of National Statistics has recently had to update the predicted UK population for the next decade by several million more people, largely to the ever-growing immigration from both the EU and the Non-EU countries. We ought therefore to mistrust the projected figures that underpin the plan being prepared by our Planning Committee which is designed to meet extremely questionable National targets.

#### 7. THE EFFECT ON WILD LIFE.

The development of the Brighton Football Club site has already had a huge impact on the Wild Life that was indigenous to the Mash Barn estate area, decimating or even eliminating the wide variety of wild life that local residents so enjoyed. The arrival of a new large influx of housing in the vicinity will require vast areas of space, thereby affecting even further the gradual depletion of the animals and plants (and even walking areas) that many residents considered among the greatest attractions of the Lancing and Sompting areas.

#### 8. LOSS OF STRATEGIC GAP (“GREEN SPACE”).

Considerable concern was expressed by residents about the effect that more housing will have on what used to be the Strategic Gap (now called “Local Green” space”). Several detected in the Local Plan the gradual diminution of the gap between localities, thereby each locality losing its

formerly clear identity. They believed the additional housing planned for Lancing and Sompting will have the effect of blurring their separate identities, especially if not enough brownfield sites within each area are not developed and owners of the previously untouched greenfield sites are encouraged by the Local Plan to build houses there.

For all the above reasons, we believe the Revised Draft Plan 2013 is quite unacceptable to the majority of Adur residents. The ADUR Planning Committee must report that the National Planning Policy Framework cannot be implemented in Adur district without massive deleterious effects on the lives of residents.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 979

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With regards to the new West Sompting proposal as drafted in the publically available 'Local Plan 2013' I would like to raise several concerns, and a selection of questions that I feel should be answered.

Having been a resident for over 20 years, I am very concerned about the impact the new proposal will have on the value of my property to date. I will be undertaking an independent propoerty evaluation prior to any planning having been approved, since the addition of affordable housing and the loss of uninterrupted scenic views to the north of my property will almost definitely devalue my property, I would like to know how the council are going to mitigate the inevitable reduction in market value.

It is not clear from Map 5 where the proposed 80 dwellings will be located in the north section of the proposed location at West Sompting. In addition there appears to be no consideration for any landscape buffering between the new dwellings and the existing houses at Malthouse Close. Will the new dwellings buffer immediately up to the gardens of my property?

A comment in Section 2.80 outlines proposed plans to support traveller accommodation within the proposed area, however gives no specific location, is this to be in the location of the 80 dwellings to the north of the proposed area? The impact of this proposal is very significant to the village of Sompting and will almost certainly cause a negative impact to an already growing traffic problem, the A27 is already vastly overrun with traffic and the current traffic calming measures in the village are frankly ineffective, the addition of 400 new properties will only add to this issue. It's important that residents have the opportunity to express their concerns and with that I make it very clear that am NOT a supporter of this proposal and feel very strongly about opposing its approval. I am sure that I am not alone when I say that this proposal will have a very detrimental effect on our village and out property.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Strategic Allocations

The County Council is supportive of the approach to provision of education infrastructure for the strategic sites outlined in the revised draft Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). A site for a 1form of entry (fe) school with the possibility to expand to 2fe is required. This is based on a consideration of the strategic sites and allocation for smaller developments within the built up area of Adur. This new primary school would be most suitably located at the New Monks Farm site, therefore land for a new primary school site will be required as part of the New Monks Farm development for both the lower and upper levels of development proposed. The schools in Lancing are all quite full and the majority are already at three forms of entry (fe). If the County Council was to continue expanding the schools, this would not comply with County policy of no more than 3fe. As outlined in the draft IDP, a further primary school site may be required as part of the Shoreham Harbour strategic allocation. This will depend on the capacity available to expand existing schools in the local area.

Revised draft policies 5, 6, & 7: Where the policies refer to 'assessments' and 'an assessment of archaeological assets (sampled by field evaluation)...' etc. Please refer to NPPF paragraph 128 which states that LPAs 'should require developers to submit a desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.' Desk based assessment (DBA), based on information obtained from the HER is a sensible starting point for major schemes and is worth including in the wording of the policy. A field evaluation (essentially a trial trenching exercise) is the most cost effective way to manage risk by quantifying whether mitigation measures will be required for proposal sites with unknown archaeological potential and establishing what level of resource will be needed. DBA and field evaluation for major schemes should be considered at the pre-application stage, not just the planning application stage to allow the results of the assessment and evaluation to be considered in good time at the determination stage.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Land at West Sompting

Development will add to the existing pressure for a safe means for walkers and cyclists, perhaps also horses, to cross the A27 and access into the South Downs National Park. This issue should be addressed through the provision of a safe and convenient means of crossing the A27. This could be through provision of a grade separated crossing to the north of the site.

Public rights of way north of the A27 need to be increased in number and status (i.e. upgrade existing footpaths to bridleways) to accommodate existing and future public needs. Bridleway connections to Lambley's Lane and Lyons Lane would be highly desired.

The site will need to link in with the existing and aspirational cycle network in West Sussex. The specified cycle / pedestrian connection to East Worthing across the green gap is not part of the current agreed Worthing cycle network. However, a connection between Sompting and Worthing is needed along with links into Lancing. Lancing station has a better service than East Worthing (including to London and Gatwick Airport), therefore public / sustainable transport needs to connect with here as well.

Draft Policy 6: It should be noted that the A27 Sompting Bypass / Upper Brighton Road junction is located within the administrative boundary of Worthing Borough Council.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Comments as above, there are bridleways directly north of the A27, to which all non-motorised users (NMUs) should have safe access. WSLAF has been in discussion with the Highways Agency regarding NMU crossings of the A27 and would be happy to share our knowledge and expertise with Adur DC Officers.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1020

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

After living in Sompting for over 50 years and seen the gradual increase in building on brown field sites. Also Western Road estates and Rectory Farm estates and over these years there has been vast increase in ownership and cars which add to the congestion.

During this period no improvements were made to the A27 only a dual carriageway to the new flyover from Lyons Farm to link up with the Brighton bypass. They used to call the new link from Dover to Honiton by pass, now it is almost nose to tail traffic at peak times.

All these minor changes have put severe pressure on Sompting, particularly in the village with all its flooding problems and its restriction of traffic flow. It is only one way on certain sections, more so when there is a road accident, which seems to be more frequent these days. The buses have difficulty getting through this narrow road, due to parked cars.

While we do need a few more affordable homes, particularly for young people who have gone to school here and married, I think the flooding problems need to be addressed first. Then look at less housing or none until the water flooding problem has been resolved. Also, better control of traffic during the peak period. The car parking problem in Sompting need to be addressed to improve traffic flow as with addition building the level of local traffic will increase.

We do need another road to the A259 from Sompting area as Grinstead Lane, Western Road and Sompting Road have become totally unsuitable for the volume and type of traffic, that uses it at peak times.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1046

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

In recent years the land north of Malthouse Close is flooded for many days. Seems to be getting worse.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1037

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

As few houses as possible as we want to retain the character of Sompting Village with as much green space as possible. This stretch of the A27 is car to car and as it is, they cut down the lanes and block up the traffic in West Street making it very difficult for buses etc. So the more people the worse the problem will be as most households have at least one car or van or both. Most people living in the Rectory Farm Estate are working people tradesmen who live in the area but travel further afield to work.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1045

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Expressed my views RE. Severe traffic problems through Sompting Village and resultant gridlock when another 480 homes are built in this locale, which could produce maybe an extra 500 cars on local roads. This is without taking the Monks Farm development into consideration which could produce another 600+ cars. I live in West Street and can bear witness to an already dire situation at certain times of day and when any problems occur on the A27.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1039

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I am one of the dreaded migrants from Brighton having only moved to the area in February 2013 so I can sympathise with those looking for an affordable house, as I was renting a house with my sister which our landlord decided to sell but we could not afford. Laction was not a key part of our search, only something with 2 bedrooms and a garden preferably a house, (as maintenance fees on flats seem to be almost extortionate these days), and transport links such as buses and a railway station in order for us to be able to get to work in Hove.

Since moving to Sompting however I have come to appreciate the location more and more. The quiet in the evenings, the birds and the wildlife, while still being able to get to the places I need to go; being keen on walking and camping but unable to drive I never thought I would be able to live in the countryside due to access and cost issues.

I live in a narrow road which currently has a fence at the end and opens out onto the field, children use the turning circle at the end of the road to play as the traffic is fairly low and as it is only used by the residents of the road it is fairly safe. If a new development is built I can see Peveril Drive becoming an access road to it with cars coming and going at all times of the day and night with increased noise and danger to children and the other residents. Our quiet neighbourhood and sense of community which are a rarity in these modern times all gone due to the local councils desire to please central government by meeting housing quotas and the Sompting Estates greed by selling as much land as they can for development. Sompting is a very unique location close enough for access to both Worthing and Lancing but still retaining its village feel and character. The building of more homes on any large scale in this location would be totally wrong. The building on Greenfield sites when there are more suitable Brownfield sites in locations in the Adur district should be prohibited. Once destroyed you cannot get the wildlife back.

Policy number 6 states that the Cokeham Brook site of nature conservation should be safeguarded and protected but if the current development plans go ahead part of the access into this site will be destroyed and due to increased traffic and environmental pollution put the site at risk from plastic and other rubbish being dumped close to it and increased human interaction with wild species.

Part 3.9 to 3.14 of the Adur draft local area plan talks about protecting the gap between Sompting and Worthing and protecting the village of Sompting due to its historic character and identity and yet the proposed development sites in Policy 6 and map 5 are so close to the village that they cannot help but impact the very things the paragraph 3.9 intends to preserve. By increased traffic along the already very narrow West Street, more people seeking access to the A27 from Busticle Lane/Western Road junction and the West Street/Upper Brighton Road junctions which are already under too much traffic pressure during rush hour, another 400, 600, 700 cars from these new developments could be dangerous to people and the environment.

In the wider Sompting area part of the Peveril ward in paragraph 3.10 of the Draft local plan has been described as the second most deprived area in the county. The building of any large development without the resources to support it will just add to these problems. No newsagents, doctor's surgeries, primary or secondary schools, increased policity, local amenities such as post offices, children's clubs; only more housing, a new playground and a community orchard. Once one Greenfield site is built on in Sompting the sites next to it lose their value and become viewed in the way as the areas between Loose Lane and West Street and between the A27 and West Street are viewed now, as areas for development.

I am hoping that by making my views known that the council will reconsider such large development as they have laid out in Policy 6, Map 5 of the Draft Adur Local Plan.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1040

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Who are we building for, the overspill from London and they are building for the rest of the world. 40 years of bad Government the worst being Labour (the working mans friend) and their mates the unions didn't moan when immigration was undermining workers. So I am totally against the amount to be built (it's not national growth of our people).

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1041

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

We cannot believe that you are thinking of putting forward houses off Dankton Lane in Sompting Village. We have complained about the heavy traffic taking short cuts and through our village from the A27 and year by year it has got worse. How will our listed building withstand, once you start bringing in the very heavy loads of trucks to build, with increase populations and more pollution. After all it is a lane!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1042

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

My concerns are that:

- The A27 congestion will reach complete saturation point.
- Insufficient infrastructure.
- The development will exacerbated flooding.
- We must preserve the green open space.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Strategic Allocation – West Sompting

This strategic allocation further erodes the district area of green gaps between Worthing and Sompting. However we welcome suggestions that more considerable enhancements are being suggested for the biodiversity in this area and the potential to open up opportunities for local people to use this green gap with sustainable transport links. These proposed transport links should be achieved through green infrastructure to ensure it fits in with the sensitivities and ecosystem functions of the landscape. We would welcome the policy to strongly uphold the ethos of the NPPF section 109 in looking for net gains in biodiversity from all aspects of a development. Words to this effect would make the policy more robust.

Revised Draft Policy 6 Land at West Sompting

As with the policy for Monks Farm we request more robust wording within the policy with reference to an ecological management plan for the site. Once again there is a need to address long term maintenance for new and existing habitats and it needs to clearly state that this will be financially supported by the developer and not a management plan without resources of financial backing.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1043

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

When we first moved in 1959 - we investigated through Worthing council what - if any- development was anticipated for the land to the rear of Ullswater. We were told categorically that there could never be building there as there were too many underground springs, brooks and bog. In those days the brooks were regularly dredged and even then it was always flooded, even with modern ways of diverting springs etc. Any property built there would have problems with damp, flooding etc. Who would want to buy?? - already there are problems in Western Road with traffic - people living there have to park cars in adjoining roads. Pedestrians take their life in their hands trying to negotiate traffic when crossing from buses on to shop. Why was the planned crossing abandoned because a few folk living in Western Road were listened to and not the majority? Do we need another accident before something is done?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 968

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Conservative Party

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

I am writing formally as the Member of Parliament for the Adur District to express my concerns at the proposals in the latest draft of the Local Plan, specifically the excessive housing allocations identified for New Monks Farm at Lancing and for West Sompting.

You will be aware that, together with local conservative district and parish councillors, I have organised two well attended public meetings at Sompting Village School on October 26th and at Lancing Parish Hall on October 31st. More than 320 people turned up at those meetings and not a single one expressed any support for the plans in their current form. I am attaching my account of these meetings from my website and please take these as a summary of the main concerns raised, which I share.

We have also circulated our own surveys to gauge concerns from a wider group of residents across Lancing and Sompting. These responses are still coming in and we will collate the findings and submit them as part of the formal consultation before the end of the two week extension period which Adur Council has helpfully granted. All those responses should therefore be treated as additional responses to be considered.

To summarise my objections:

- New Monks Farm is a well established flood plain. It contains a complicated series of drainage ditches which flow north west - south-east towards the River Adur and sluice gates at Adur Rec with a very shallow rise which makes it very vulnerable to blockage. Whilst it may be possible to alleviate flood hazard on new homes it can only be done at the expense of existing homes already very susceptible to flooding. The damage we saw last Christmas affecting the area around Manor Close and Grinstead Lane was the worst for very many years and that is before any new buildings have been added. It is essential that this flood plain is preserved for the protection of dwellings on the Mash Barn Estate and surrounds, West Beach to the south and indeed to the continued working of the Airport. In addition there are already considerable problems with sewerage capacity. Whilst some limited fringe development may be feasible around the edges, development on anything like the scale being proposed is completely unsustainable and unviable.

- Traffic congestion is already a nightmare on the A27. Simply adding a new roundabout is not guaranteed to help alleviate the existing problem let alone the additional traffic resulting from a further 600 homes being added to the area. Added to this will be further traffic caused by the proposed new school and business development.

- At West Sompting, the number of houses represents a very substantial ingress which can only change the character of this village. Again some limited fringe development is possible but the amount proposed is not sustainable. There is a flooding consideration where previously the area around West Street has been very prone to surface water flooding. The traffic situation in and around West Street is already chaotic despite significant investment in traffic calming measures with limited effect. With very limited access points into the new development where again most residents will need to rely on private vehicles, the details around traffic calms and ameliorative measures are recklessly vague. Whilst there is likely to be some 'pay back' with enhanced facilities in return for the new development, it is clear that the balance is still completely out of proportion.

- Overall there are serious question marks about the robustness of the demographic data and population growth forecasts being used. It is unclear

where the demand will come from, above and beyond, the level of social rented housing which is already required to cater with existing local waiting lists. Adur needs to make a very forceful case to the Planning Inspectorate that we have serious grounds to be considered a special case for not being able to take the level of additional housing being asked of us. Few other regions are restricted by a coastline to the south and a national park to the north, where 53% of the district's area space is covered by national park designated land. The remaining target area is therefore already a very densely populated urban coastal strip with very few spaces left for significant development on this scale. We are not an inner city district with a continuous urban character, we are a coastal district in a rural county and as such we do not have the infrastructure to cope with an even more densely populated area.

I hope that all these facts will be robustly deployed by Adur Council when formulating its final submission to the Planning Inspectorate. To do so otherwise would be to sanction a crazy level of irresponsible and unsustainable over-development which will impact hugely on the quality of life for the many thousands of residents who have chosen to live in Adur for very many years.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1054

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Yes, I think we are in too much hurry, we are on a flood plain here. They do not want to put more than two exits it seems a problem about money. I also think that we are not being told the whole truth, only what you think. We should know, after making some enquiries, I found that we are 1 metre above sea level.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1036

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Many reservations and about to make a formal submission. Main points will be:

1. Access to the proposed developments is not good enough.
  2. It is not possible to accommodate any more local traffic in West Street, Cokeham Road, Crabree Lane, Busticle Lane or Grinstead Lane (A2025). The whole area is already saturated during many parts of the day.
  3. The area is already overdeveloped and no more housing south and the Downs in Sompting can be accommodated.
  4. There is already too much 'social housing' in the area. The current residents want no more.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 899

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 98

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir,

Please accept this letter as my formal objection to the recently published version of the Adur Draft Local Plan and in particular the suggested build of approximately 480 dwellings at West Sompting, made up with 80 dwellings built at Sompting North (north of West Street) and 400 dwellings at Sompting Fringe (south of West Street).

The reasons as to why I am against this development are:

1. We are UNIQUE in the Adur district because we are in a narrow strip of land between the South Downs National Park to the North and the sea to the South meaning that there are fewer gaps left between what is already a built up area and for this reason we cannot be expected to take any further development...Other parts of the country have more space for development.
2. The Sompting Gap is hugely important as a wildlife corridor and this on its own makes it worth preserving, the strategic gaps are especially essential to stop Sompting merging into Worthing or Lancing in Sompting which would create an overpopulated urban coastal strip. It is there to preserve the separate identity and character of the area.
3. If we allow this development to proceed it would set a dangerous precedent for many more applications being made for inappropriate development.
4. Traffic congestions would get worse. West Street is already a nightmare on a daily basis because it is used by impatient and aggressive drivers using it as a RATRUN trying to bypass congestion on the A27, the traffic calming measures that already exist to do not work in reducing the amount of traffic or the speed that they are travelling, so further traffic management of extending traffic calming and intensifying existing measures will have no effect/benefit for West Street whatsoever. Emergency services already have difficulty carrying out their job around West Street and Sompting.
5. Sompting and Sompting Village were also mentioned by the WSCC Highways that no more developments should be considered until A27 traffic situation was dealt with.
6. Flooding is also a problem around West Street and this will only increase and get worse if additional properties are built within the area.
7. The infrastructure for these additional houses is not in place. We already have appalling roads, undermining of the emergency services. Overstretched medical services, declining bus services, overcrowding of schools and we do not have the water/sewerage capacity.

Please take my views into account when considering this plan. In addition I would like to be kept informed of any further changes or plans regarding the local plan.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 107

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 108

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 109

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RD Policy 6 - West Sompting

Para 2.73 - There are a large number of equestrians in the Sompting area, opening up the countryside should bring benefits for all NMUs by providing multi-use prov.

Para 2.77 - Due to the lack of off-road routes, equestrians have to use the local roads. Any development will increase traffic on these roads and affect their safety, any Transport Assessment must also look at impacts on vulnerable road users (walkers, cyclists, equestrians).

Policy Bullet Point 5 - Any new off-road links should be multi-use where possible, to bring greater public benefit.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 110

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 903

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the plan for additional housing in the defined area on the basis that there is insufficient road capacity to accommodate the proposed development. It would also breach the strategic gap and alter the character of this conservation area irrevocably.

It will also impact on drainage and wildlife in the area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1053

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Given the Government directive that we must build more houses in Sompting, I think the Council have come up with a reasonable plan building 480 houses West of Dankton Lane and West and South of Loose Lane.

My concerns are for the infrastructure to support extra people (water, sewage, schools, doctors, police etc). The erosion of the Gap between Worthing and Sompting. The effect on wildlife and the proposed site and what if they want more houses than the 480 in the future.

But my biggest concern is the A27 which is at times gridlocked from Lyons Farm to Dankton Lane now without the extra housing.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 900

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The area is already deprived, a load of new houses isn't going to help and who's going to buy them when people don't want to live there anyway? That's why it's all elderly people and social housing, people who don't have much choice.

Sompting village primary will not be able to support the increase in pupils from this development, especially considering the high birth rates of recent years and in the local demographic.

The roads in this area are not able to take the extra traffic from this development and are not suitable for improvement.

Are you seriously considering building houses on a flood plain at sea level? Look at all the drainage ditches on the plan, they are there for a reason. Would you buy one? Would you put your mother in one? If the answer is no then you shouldn't do it. Will insurers want to insure them and at what cost? Honestly, recent years' flood issues should make you think twice about this one and what about all the flood defence money that will be needed to protect the development? This area was under standing water for months a few years ago when we had a very wet winter, ask the airport how much they had to pump off the airfield and it will give you an idea of what problems you'll face with this one.

Also, the A27 and A259 are already under strain in this area at peak times, they cannot take any more traffic. The trains are already full at peak times and the bus services in the area are pretty much non-existent and likely to stay that way while Stagecoach run them

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 911

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I have read the Adur Draft Plan regarding proposals for housing development in West Sompting, and I am astounded that proposals are even being made when many of the reasons why it shouldn't happen are actually referred to in the report. ie

Para 2.74.. "Access to the southern part of the site would be via Loose Lane and West Street." Loose Lane runs into West Street, so let's be clear, all traffic would have to go into West Street. Turning right would be impossible at times, whilst turning left into West Street – well I can't imagine why anyone would even propose this! (Anyone wanting to go east would be encouraged to rat run past the Sompting Village School through Whitestyles Road and into west Street – another hazard created!)

Para 2.75.. "traffic from this site will pass through the congested North Lancing roundabout to travel east." Yes CONGESTED now, your words, any more traffic will make it even worse.

Para 2.75.. "the proposed A27/Dankton Lane junction will require further investigation." How can you put forward a proposal for development when you haven't looked at solutions to problems? Because there aren't any?

Para 2.75.. "any local road improvements affecting Sompting Village Conservation Area must respect its historic character." The historic character is already being ruined with the huge amount of traffic currently, without making the situation considerably worse.

Para 2.76 .. "West Street experiences traffic problems, in part caused by westbound traffic ratrunning to bypass the congestion on the A27." That's correct, so what is your proposed solution? More traffic calming, leading to more traffic, slower traffic, more queues, more noise and air pollution, worsening of the historic nature of the Village and MORE misery for people living there.

Para 2.77 .. "A full transport assessment will be required to look at access etc and how the necessary mitigation measures will be delivered." Why hasn't this been done already? Simply because there is no solution to the problem of more traffic, more delays, more noise and a whole lot worsening of life for the people there.

Para 2.78.. "The site lies predominately within Flood Zones detailed, parts of the site are at risk from surface water flooding." There are times now when after periods of heavy rain, much of West Street is under water, leading to subsidence. This problem has never been resolved, how can anyone say that with more housing producing an increased risk of flooding, the problem will be eliminated?

I could go on, but I believe that my comments (and your own) have sufficiently demonstrated that it would be foolish to press ahead with more housing development in West Sompting.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 111

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 112

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to houses being built in West Street Sompting. As this will cause more traffic problems onto the A27 through to Worthing as it 'cannot cope' with the 'build up of cars' now, it will also cause a backlog along West Street as people use this road when there are traffic queues on the A27, as a cut through. I do not have a policy number as you are aware what I am objecting about. We will lose all the countryside that people love if this goes ahead. I am sure I am not the only one with objections to this matter. It will cause problems. For residents and travellers amongst 'CHAOS'!!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 113

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 117

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

The A27 needs priority before you consider house building in Sompting, as this is just not acceptable for the residents. West Street is just not ready for a development of this size.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 120

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 122

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 594

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 451

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 901

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1. I have spoken to my GP at the "Ball Tree Surgery" firstly he was unaware of the draft plan and secondly he stated that the practice was at maximum capacity and could not take on any more doctors as they haven't the space. The practice has no contingency plans in place as it has not been consulted at this stage. It has taken up to two weeks for me to get an appointment to see my own GP.
2. Worthing hospital seems to be at full capacity with even disabled patients finding it near impossible to park. The last time I had an appointment there I had to park at the Splashpoint leisure centre.
3. Sir Robert Woodard Academy is presently at maximum capacity and will have to make provisions for the extra intake of the 11 year olds.
4. Secondary pupils from the "West Sompting" development will have to go to East Worthing school creating increased traffic flow along West Street at peak times, and, if cycling, put themselves at risk on a busy and narrow road.
5. Sompting Village Primary school seems to also be at maximum capacity and I can see no provision for an extra primary school in the plans.
6.  The emergency services complain that they can't use West Street in response to emergencies due to the congestion and have to use the A27.
7. The A27 is already very congested and the development of the old Norwich Union site has only added to this problem.
8. With West Street acting as a pressure release valve for the A27 it takes considerably more traffic than it should and regularly comes to a complete halt for significant lengths of time.
9. The local bus service has been drastically reduced with no service at all covering West Street and the local area on Sundays or after 7pm.
10. The Lancing/Shoreham/Steyping learning partnership area has the lowest proportion of school leavers continuing into learning and the highest proportion into unemployment and education levels for adult are lower in Adur than for West Sussex as a whole. (ref Adur a community profile by the University of Brighton October 2002)

In conclusion the local infrastructure will be unable to cope with the increase in population from the three sites at "West Sompting" and "New Monks Farm".

#### Sompting/Worthing Gap

1. Dankton Lane north of the A27 acts as a corridor for wildlife.
2.  The field bounded by Dankton Lane and Malthouse Close acts as a funnel for wildlife allowing it access to the "Sompting Gap"
3. The character of the fields, bounded by West Street, A27, Church Lane and Dankton Lane, being pasture not arable means they support a greater range of prey animals.
4. If the development in the area bounded by Dankton Lane, A27 and Malthouse Close is developed the route for wildlife will be blocked by it and Sompting Abbots School thus giving no clear route to the gap without coming into contact with areas of human activity.

In conclusion the range of wildlife using the "West Sompting" North site will be seriously degraded. At present birds such as barn owls, kestrel, black kite, sparrow hawks, quail, pheasant, sea birds, garden and woodland birds use this area. I have also seen fox, deer, rabbit, field mice, bats and moles using the area.

#### Flooding

1.  At present the fields north of West Street act as a sponge soaking up excess water and releasing it slowly. However, even presently they can't

absorb all the water from heavy periods of rain and light flooding takes place.

2. The field "West Sompting" North which borders my property is 1 metre higher than my property and the clay substructure is only 0.4 metres below that.

In conclusion the risk of flooding in West Street especially in the areas between Church Lane and Street Barn, the Eastern end of West Street, Malthouse Close and Dankton Lane will increase.

#### Access

1. The access on to Dankton lane is very restricted, at its Southern end it is bounded on its Eastern edge by a flint wall which restricts visibility and is very narrow, there are many minor accidents there where people cut the corner because they can't see traffic approaching the junction. At the northern end the access is via the A27 into a very narrow road. Turning off here is extremely dangerous due to the speed of the traffic and which the WSCC highways have said will not be improved.
2. Dankton Lane is one of the accesses to West Street which people use when the A27 is backed up causing significant problems for residents.

#### Personal Concerns

1. The loss of access to the downs and northern Worthing via the footpath across the "West Sompting" North field.
2. Lack of privacy and security due to my boundary wall only being 1.2 meters high on the development side.
3. The coastal strip from Brighton to Bognor has sustained a significant amount of development over the years with significant loss of country side amenities and the further erosion of our green spaces and strategic gaps can only worsen our quality of life.

#### To summarise

I am against any development which encroaches on our few remaining strategic gaps and believe that these developments will have a detrimental effect on the lives of people living in the Lancing and Sompting area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 923

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Two main concerns:

- At the moment the field adjoining Dankton Lane is a natural run off for rainwater draining from the Downs. What happens to this when houses are located on this site??? The worry is it will naturally divert to the existing properties in the area causing flooding problems.
- 480 new houses mean an additional 500-1000 cars on top of an already ridiculous traffic problem in the area - how is this going to be resolved????

In addition to these points, Sompting currently has a lovely 'village' feel which will be destroyed by cramming 480 properties into it, particularly on the Dankton Lane site, with the Lane/village road already being used as a 'rat run' during peak traffic times. It seems that nowadays, a spare area of 'green' is fair game for new houses, whether it is suitable or not!!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1055

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Look at attachment for 'Keep the Gaps' petition letter.  
Please see copy of letter sent to Mr Parkin. If he is part of the consultation, then yes we have made a formal submission.

In our opinion, until such time central government agree to building improvements to the A27 between Shoreham and Chichester then no more building should take place. Infrastructure should come before the homes are built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This site has the lowest flood risk of the proposed allocations and we are therefore supportive of its inclusion in the Plan. In addition this site provides opportunities to deliver significant ecological enhancements.

We are pleased to see that within the Policy wording specific reference is made to contributions towards the Teville Stream project which will bring multi-functional benefits to the local community as well as delivering the Water Framework Directive. We also support the enhancement of the Cokeham Brooks Site of Nature Conservation Interest.

We are pleased to see that our previous recommendations have been incorporated and consider the text in paragraph 2.78 gives an accurate picture of flood risk and clear expectations of the sequential approach to site layout. We recommend that you may wish to also include this requirement within the Policy itself.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1056

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

We love it here, we have worked so hard to make our home lovely and we would like to think of this as our forever home. However, the plans for building on the cow field just south of the A27 fills me with dread. The lane will become over congested, the houses an eyesore, and the traffic ridiculous. I was told the Lord of the Manor vowed not to build on the cow field. A preservation site for wildlife and the horses to graze. I can't believe this is happening.

Quite rightly, the emergency services will struggle to get about with the new developments in Sompting IF they go ahead... we are a VILLAGE. We don't wish to become a town. We struggle in resources such as schools at the moment and a new high school in East Worthing as a potential is still a long way get there as there is no easy way there from Sompting.

Developing 1000 homes? Potentially 2000 extra vehicles. Does anyone not give consideration for the extra congestion this will cause? We don't have the road infrastructure!! Ok, so developments may occur in Chichester but not here in Worthing. An obscene idea in reality and totally out of order. I am sure there are various other locations in Sussex to develop, just not here. I can understand redeveloping sites that already have disused or run down buildings on. Just around the road from me there are empty warehouses. I suggest if there has to be any redevelopment at all, build on this wasteland.

However, it still doesn't lend itself to the local amenities in which we are struggling with at the moment. What I mean by this are shops and doctors surgeries.

If you are going to ruin our village, let karma come and find you.

We cannot facilitate such a huge development in this narrow strip of land between the sea and the downs. It's only a mile wide. Please, I beg you to reconsider and think of other sites.

KEEP OUR GREEN SPACES. Don't develop on our land.

I'm hoping surveillance will be in force for a while to see how awful the traffic is when there is an accident/incident on the A27 and West Street becomes gridlocked. It's an experience, I tell you, sitting in traffic, which isn't even a two way street, but with passing places. It all gets terribly snarled up up to Grove Lodge roundabout...and has only got worse since Aviva became the new Worthing College. I have to endure this every day for work, and it's not nice. I've tried all of the rat runs, and in most cases these are not much better either.

The BOTTOM LINE is that we cannot accommodate anymore housing in the area to the degree in which the plans suggest. I wish, hope and pray we keep our GREENSPACES. Let us not be a concrete jungle. Right now there is nothing for kids to do in the area, and not even a proper playground for the hundreds of children who go to the SVP School. Nothing. Why impose more families in the area?! What about the extra sewage issues, let alone flooding. Under my house is the drainage for all of the houses in the lane. The drains couldn't cope with anymore sewage. My neighbour has had issues with rising WC water in his bathrooms to the point it's overflowed in the past. We cannot have anymore houses built in this immediate area. Just to satisfy the Governments expectations?? It's the wrong area. Find alternatives, not Sompting.

We need to be left alone!

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Para 2.70 recognises the visual impact of this strategic development on viewpoints within the national park and the need to mitigate this impact through sensitive landscaping: we welcome this recognition and its incorporation into Revised Draft Policy 6.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 934

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 933

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 932

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1057

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

I am very concerned by the scale of the proposed development in Sompting and think it will spoil the character of the village and the area cannot cope with it. The roads, schools and doctors surgery will be over burdened.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 909

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the plan for additional housing in the defined area on the basis there there is insufficient road capacity to accommodate the proposed development. It would also breach the strategic gap and alter the character of this conservation area irrevocably.

It will also impact on drainage and wildlife in the area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 930

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although mentioned in the proposal there have been a number of occasions where West Street has been gridlocked due to the 'rat run'. The road can barely cope during busy times.

My children attend Bramber school and we walk to school along what is a very dangerous road. The extra traffic will make West Street horrendous. The increased traffic would certainly put children attending the school, walking along West Street, at a huge risk.

There is no mention of extra school places which already tight and a number of schools have already extended to cope with current numbers.

Extra policing would be required for the increased traffic and population.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 910

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to any major house building in the Sompting area until there is a Shoreham/Lancing/Worthing bypass constructed. The building of 480 houses in West Sompting would cause traffic chaos in the area, particularly the Lyons Farm traffic lights and through the village.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 922

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having lived in Sompting for 30 years, it has a lovely small village feel, the possible addition of 480 extra houses will completely ruin this. Whilst I appreciate the need for more houses, why can't it be on a smaller scale, and in places where it will have less impact. The new development on the site where the Ball Tree pub, being a good example.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1058

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Additional traffic - Dankton Lane becomes gridlocked with traffic when the A27 becomes congested. My back garden faces Dankton Lane and in the summer we suffer exhaust fumes from stationary traffic.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1059

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Yes I do have a great deal of concern, but by the sounds of things the land has already been sold, and someone has made a profit whilst upsetting an entire village. I do believe that we can all make a stand, but I regret to say that I feel like I am just a number rather than a human being trying to live.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1060

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

VIA THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

Traffic in our village is a nightmare. West Street is gridlocked as it is without an additional 480 houses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 916

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Hargreaves Management Limited

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Representations from Hargreaves Management Limited

As significant landowners within the Adur area and particularly, Shoreham, Hargreaves have considered the revised draft Local Plan and have the following comments / observations.

6

It is essential that a pipeline of employment land is provided throughout the plan period.

Considerable residential development is proposed within the Borough and employment land needs to be provided to accommodate this growth in the population as well as the continued expansion of existing Companies, both in relation to increasing their workforce due to the economic up-turn and such Companies, currently located within the Borough being able to expand. There also needs to be provision for Companies who are currently not within the Borough but wish to locate within the Borough.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 913

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Sirs

Whilst in principle we agree that Adur will require some regeneration and new homes for the future We feel we must register some concerns for our immediate area and some that affect us directly

#### # Known Flood Area

Having suffered from both front and rear gardens being under water many times we are concerned that large square metres of ground at the Monks Farm site will be infilled with concrete resulting in lots more surface water being displaced to the surrounding area which is already fragile with high water tables.

We are not confident that any sewer and drainage installed will cope with periods of prolonged wet weather.

How can they test the sustainability of these proposed drainage systems.?

The ditches at the rear of our property have recently been cleared to a depth of half a metre and although we are very grateful for this a heavy fall of rain last week raised the water level 4 inches overnight and flowed over the depth of the new ditch causing the bank below our garden being waterlogged.

#### # Infrastructure

We live on the A27 on the South Side between the Tempest Garage and the Sports Centre Roundabout and witness the traffic levels on a daily basis.

We currently rely on the traffic lights at the airport to provide a gap in busy traffic to enable us to enter and exit our property- sometimes having to wait for 3 changes as gaps sometimes don't happen dependent on speed of traffic.

( We are one of 2 bungalows with longer front garden and no slip road so have to exit directly on to the A27)

In all honesty any new commercial or residential buildings which would automatically increase levels of traffic should not be considered at all until a bypass is constructed as current levels of traffic often cannot be accommodated - we are a known bottleneck at busy times with frequent accidents being reported which cause gridlock.

The Revised Adur Plan page 163 states that the Flood Risk Assessment to be undertaken needs to demonstrate that all new buildings must remain safe for their lifetime and that those sites will not increase flood risk elsewhere!!!!

We are in a small area betwixt downs and sea with highly developed areas already built with the remainder land being vulnerable to flooding.

Please reconsider your plan and reduce housing and commercial levels and make it known to the Government that it is improper to impose building on such a level of development that is not viable in a fragile environment nor comparable with other counties with more open space and better road infrastructure.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 1061

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Liberal Democrats

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I support the view of Sompting residents that this development would create unacceptable infrastructure pressures on Sompting, especially with heavier traffic on already over-loaded roads. I am concerned that the reduction in the 'green gap' implied by this development would make farming uneconomic on the remaining land and would ultimately lead to further development between Sompting and Worthing. My petition, to be submitted separately, also covers this policy.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 886

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 931

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Persimmon Homes South Coast

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Turley Associates

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

#### First & Second Bullets

To be consistent with Draft Policy 3 (in so far as housing requirements not being expressed as maximums) and provide flexibility over the final number of units brought forward within site constraints once designed in detail, we would suggest the word 'Around' or 'Approximately' is added at the start of these bullet points.

#### Fifth Bullet

See paragraph 2.68 comments above. Suggest word 'provided' be replaced by 'encouraged' until certainty over the delivery of this project can be ascertained.

#### Sixth Bullet

For clarity and effectiveness, suggest removing 'maximising opportunities' and 'and workplace' from the text. The former adds little in our view to the objective of the remaining text. The latter is not considered particularly relevant for a residential allocation.

#### Second Paragraph

Our client objects to the inclusion of this requirement. The Council have not demonstrated this site meets the criteria of Draft Policy 23. To incorporate such uses may well reduce the capacity of the allocation proposed, increasing unmet housing needs in the district further than that already stated. We are also unclear how this option was arrived at against alternatives, which part of the site is being considered, what impact this would have on the delivery of the remaining allocation and what consultation there has been with our client or the Gypsy and Traveller community. We therefore recommend this be deleted.

#### Fourth Paragraph (Fourth Bullet)

Suggest words 'provision for formal sports' is replaced by 'if proven necessary a financial contribution towards the provision of formal sports in accordance with Council standards.' The requirement for formal open space in this location against alternatives has not been thoroughly tested, nor has the impact this would have on the site's housing capacity. The need for formal open space and the delivery options for this within and beyond district boundaries should be assessed thoroughly before such a requirement could be progressed as an option. The social / economic impact of any reduction in housing capacity at the site would also need to be assessed to justify such a proposal. In the absence of such evidence we would suggest the amendment proposed. Options should be explored by the Council to identify specific deliverable projects to fund in the area as proven necessary. We have added the words 'where necessary' to our revised text, as the plan period runs to 2031. This wording therefore provides flexibility for negotiation over this period if such provisions and priorities change.

#### Sixth Paragraph

Our client has recommend this be deleted as the project is unlikely to be reasonably related or necessary for the impact created by the development proposed in Policy 6. Further drainage assessments are being completed and will be submitted to the Council to inform the next consultation stages of the Local Plan.

#### Ninth Paragraph

Add 'where necessary' to the end of this requirement to provide greater flexibility for negotiation over such matters for a plan period to 2031.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 612

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

When considering the infrastructure at Sompting, some of the flooding problems are due to the state of the Teville stream, North of the railway at Sompting/East Worthing.

Historically, the land south of West Street Sompting is drained by the ditches, which flow south into the Teville stream and finally out to sea.

The Teville stream also influences the drainage of a much wider area, several square miles it is believed. Before the Second World War, the Teville stream was a substantial water way, supporting home drawn barge traffic.

You might be aware of the foregoing, but it might be helpful. My family farmed locally for several years.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 669

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I don't want anymore buildings going up. There has been constant building work and I am fed up.

I object to all the plans. Use the empty homes and offices and convert them. Surely it would be cheaper?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 668

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are not against the building of new houses for people to live in, but we feel that the proposed plans will inevitably put increasing pressure on the A27, particularly when it becomes a one lane road at Lyons Farm. Some form of by-pass is needed before new homes are built.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 667

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am totally opposed to the proposed development plans for Sompting and find it hard to believe the scale of housing that is being considered. There is no need for extra housing for local residents as few people live and work in Sompting. Therefore, most housing will be for people moving from Brighton areas. The village, and it is a village, struggles to retain its identity and I have lived here for over 40 years. More housing just makes Sompting part of the surrounding towns and threatens its rural existence. The proposed strategic gap that would be left would be totally inadequate to protect Sompting from urban sprawl.

Traffic is a major and worsening problem. It causes significant bottlenecks in our village and on the A27. How can the residents and other road users here possibly cope with such large increases in volume that would be caused by such a large development plan? The loss of natural environment will have a devastating effect on our village's natural wide variety of animals including badgers, owls, sparrow hawks and greater spotted woodpeckers.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 666

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 665

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 610

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: West Street Sompting/Upper Brighton Road Worthing, and the intention to build 2 housing estates in Lancing and Sompting.

I live in West Street Sompting and have to deal with on a daily basis the stressful, time consuming and sometimes completely dangerous traffic jams that come about when people try to cut through the village from the A27.

Up until my daughter started school this September, travelling through my own road has just been a huge inconvenience, but now I have to walk her to and from school daily and it's treacherous.

We have to walk along a pavement that is sometimes inches thick and the traffic is literally almost touching you as it passes you. We have to keep crossing the road, as there is not a pavement that runs the length of one side of the road, sometimes the pavement disappears altogether.

We then choose to walk across a muddy field as one you come out of West Street and into Upper Brighton Road, there is no pavement at all for 180 metres.

What concerns me even more is that next year I will be doing this walk with a newborn baby. Some of the pavements are too slim to accommodate a pushchair, leaving no choice but to stick out into the road. I will also be unable to take the pushchair across the field that we use, so will have to walk along the pavement-less 180 metres of Upper Brighton Road. This fills me with absolute dread, as this road is a serious accident waiting to happen.

With the intention of building 2 housing estates nearby, this is only going to intensify an already enormous problem unless something is done to sort it out.

One of the best suggestions I have heard, is turning Church Lane into an exit only. This will stop all the hundreds of cars that shoot down it daily, and cut through Sompting Village in the attempt to save time from the Lyons Farm traffic lights.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 611

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 686

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 781

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support the scheme. We would argue for a variety of housing sizes (as on the site of the Balltree) that will enhance the social mix in Sompting. Probably more needs to be done to prevent through traffic using West Street. We like the environmental improvements suggested for Sompting.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 671

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 829

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The proposed housing of 480 homes in West Sompting would lead to an increase in population that would put an unacceptable strain on already overstretched local infrastructure, especially roads. The A27 has daily gridlocks and severe congestion, this will only become worse, the plans do not make any viable suggestions as to how to deal with this extra congestion. The roads in this area are already at maximum saturation.

The plans would also place an unacceptable burden on Schools, Health, Fire and Police services.

In addition it would increase the risk of flooding, already a big problem, denying valuable run off land for rain water thereby increasing the risk of flooding to existing houses, one of which I live in.

The negative environmental impact to local wildlife and fauna should also be considered.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 613

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

I would like to add to the above that when purchasing our property in 1959, we approached Worthing council to see what plans they had for the land to the rear of our garden - they categorically stated that no building would ever be built on that land as it was full of underground springs and waterlogged. Lots of problems would arise if houses were now built there - for the builders and buyers (if any?!)

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 663

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 662

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 614

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 616

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 661

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Very strongly object.

All the facts below are very significant. It will ruin Sompting and once done, it cannot go back.

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 660

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I should like to point out that I and everyone that I speak to in the Sompting Village area share none of the excitement that the developers hold in bringing plans to shoehorn more housing into the green areas of the Sompting Village.

I can honestly say that not one person that I have spoken to about these proposed developments has shown any support to the developers plans and that they all seem to think that we are already overdeveloped as a village.

The impact on the local infrastructure would be detrimental to many aspects of this village including;

- The already too busy roads, as we already have too much traffic trying to find a quicker route through from the A27 to wherever they are trying to get to. This is creating a rat run with increasing numbers of cars, lorries and buses trying to squeeze through.
- More residential traffic for the new developments in an already over stressed local road system . It will simply not be able to cope with any heavier volume of traffic.
- This will result in more stationary traffic than before, more traffic jams, more stressed commuters, more road-rage incidents and more road accidents.
- All of this in an area adjacent to the local first school and a high volume of youngsters making their way back and forth to school and play areas. The dangers of crossing a busy road are obvious, and the dangers of which I am sure you would not want to bring to your doorsteps.

There are many other reasons that the local people feel should be brought to the table including;

- The irretrievable loss of village life, brought about by the sprawl of the towns overtaking the identity of the village that we enjoy living in.
- The loss of conservation areas and the loss of the clearly defined strategic gap between Sompting and the surrounding areas.

As a normal hard working, tax-paying, law abiding person, it would be nice to think that having taken the time to write this letter and to make the points that have been made, that this letter would have some sort of bearing on the decision making process that is put there to stop the developers running rampant. However, I fear that this is all about the money?

Put simply, the people that are putting forward these proposals are in it for the money; they are not on a crusade to house the homeless. At a wild guess, I would say that the decision on the future of Sompting Village will be made by people who more than likely do not live here or in the immediate areas; therefore they do not give a hoot about the effect it has on those of us that do live here.

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.

- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 664

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 679

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 685

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 684

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 683

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 682

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 603

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 628

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 604

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 605

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 609

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

As a cyclist I find it quite dangerous already cycling through Sompting Village, despite having the right of way. If this new development goes ahead, I will just give up as 480+ cars will make it impossible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 680

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 670

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We purchased our bungalow as we like our view of the countryside. Any development to the Meadowview Road (Sompting) region would be detrimental, and not 'retain the historic character and identity of the village'.  
We would reject/object to any development proposals in this area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 763

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 678

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Over-development means more cars, more pollution and overstretched facilities.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 607

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 677

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

To build as many houses as planned would be madness. Our roads are already very busy, especially the A27. This scheme would affect so many things, including: doctors, dentists, schools and mostly traffic. It would not be fair on current residents in this area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 675

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The building of nearly 500 houses in Sompting is absurd. The strain on schools and doctors surgeries will be enormous. However, the main objection must be the roads. Driving along West Street and the A27 is horrendous and is already causing road rage. Please think again.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 608

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 674

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Traffic is already at an impossible level and is very badly affecting the lives of people living in Sompting. My wife and I could not get into Worthing in time to support our daughter in the birth of our grandson recently. That opportunity will not come to us again. Blocked by the traffic jam on the A27.

More housing is not needed.

Employment in the area will not support more residents, which means much more traffic 'movement'/jams in and out of Sompting.

We have lived in Sompting for 35 years and have seen traffic increase enormously. We personally have open view from our rear windows, which is one of the main reasons we bought the house. That will be taken from us - we are quite depressed by the whole situation. The nature of our existence here will change for the worse forever, and will cause us to have to move from here. We are retired and never imagined this world being forced on us.

We still like the village feel and are desperately unhappy about the possible increase in housing/people/traffic/pollution/noise.

There is no room for such an increase here. Please stop it.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 618

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 606

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 626

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We need more houses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 659

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 642

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .

If 14 houses are too many in 2011, 480 would be overwhelming in 2014.

2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.

This area is gridlocked between 8-9am and 4-5.30pm.

3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.

4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.

5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 641

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Before more houses are built in this area, the A27 needs upgrading!

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 624

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 640

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 625

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

What concerns me is the damage to the flood plains and wildlife at the Sompting Gap, which is known to flood into Ullswater and into Thirlmere Crescent. My objection is to the whole plan to build in Sompting when you are well aware of the flooding in these areas. A wide area was flooded last winter, and this will happen again if this area is built upon.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 639

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 638

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 644

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 636

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 645

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 635

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 634

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 627

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 633

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 632

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 631

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 630

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 629

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 637

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 621

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 602

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 658

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 657

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: KEEP GAPS ON THE MAP.

Please help keep the 'gaps on the map' by stopping flood risk development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

We understand that planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area and stopped circulation of traffic; at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The 'Gaps' are important to wild life as well as to our quality of life and they are being eroded away. 'Action plans' are not enough. This development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is, yet alone with the potential of an extra 1000 cars pouring on to it!

The Sussex resevoirs were almost dry a short time ago, so how can the water company cope with more than 1000 extra people requiring water supply and sewage disposal.

What, if any, plans are there to cope with the need for extra schools, nurseries, work, doctors, dentists, policing, recreation spaces etc? The whole infrastructure is effectively creaking at the seams already so please, how is it expected to cope with more people?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 656

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 655

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 654

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 653

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 619

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 643

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Flooding? Doctors? Hospital? Schools? Traffic and roads?

Are all of these problems going to be addressed?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 620

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

Creating enough schools?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 617

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 622

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 651

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 650

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 649

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 623

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 648

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 647

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 646

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 652

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 596

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 749

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This plan for new housing is unacceptable, mainly because of the infrastructure of the roads in and around Sompting. West Street is excessively busy anyway as a cut through from the A27 - extra traffic would cause gridlock of traffic within Sompting. In rush hour, it is far too busy in West Street with long delays when leaving or arriving at our driveway. No consideration is given to residents by other motorists rushing through West Street. There is no way without building a new East/West Road that any extra housing can be considered by the council in Sompting (New road South of Loose Lane).

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 532

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 744

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My wife and I strongly object to new homes being built on New Monks Farm, Lancing and Sompting strategic green gaps. There was so much serious flooding in Lancing last winter and it will put homes at even higher risk. Also, our roads are so congested already and the A27 will not cope with another two housing estates spilling into it. The proposed exits from both sides would cause a nightmare scenario. Please keep Sompting and Lancing as they are.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 742

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

There are very little open spaces left in Sompting. We do not want to lose them. Travelling along the A27 between Hillbarn and the Warren is horrendous. We cannot take any more houses and traffic.

With regards to accommodating a Gypsy/Traveller site, Withy Patch is there for them!

The plan gives figures for the cost of road alterations - how can that be affordable in regards to reduced public spending?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 595

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 739

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The new buildings that are planned will not benefit the area in my opinion. They will increase the number of residents, which will have a knock on effect on everything such as roads and schools.

I do not want my children having to travel miles away to go to school because there are no spaces at the local school - it is already cramped as it is.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 737

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

There are too many cars on West Street now and it is always blocked in rush hour. Cars drive too fast and pressure me to get into my drive quickly as they have no patience and the car horn is used regularly. More cars would be a crazy idea.

Think logically please.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 736

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It will make the traffic problem we have now come to a complete standstill. There are not enough school, doctors or dentists, and it will cause more pressure for the hospital, fire and police services that already cannot cope. The thought of all of these services having to provide for another couple of thousand or more people is unthinkable. There is also the wildlife and the fantastic views to consider.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 599

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 734

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to these house building plans in Sompting for the following reasons:

- 1) The overwhelming amount of extra traffic this would create in Sompting would be unsustainable. Neither the A27, A259 or surrounding minor roads will be able to cope with yet another 1000+ vehicles. If either the A27 or A259 is blocked due to the frequent accidents that occur or by roadworks, the build-up in traffic on the remaining open road is incredible. From experience, it can take over 4 hours to travel 4 miles. It will make it harder to visit the doctors on the A27 and also to visit the shopping centres at Lyons Farm and Holmbush, which is already becoming a problem. Buses will continuously be late and this will affect the most vulnerable and elderly residents of Sompting. This will in turn drastically reduce the quality of life for all residents.
- 2) Sompting is a village has the oldest Saxon Church in England, as well as a well presented private school. Within the main part of the village is a Conservation Area, which has now become a rat run for the A27. It is dangerous to travel through the village due to the amount of traffic that uses it. These extra houses will only exacerbate the situation and it will become totally impossible to drive through that part of the village. This area should be preserved - not totally destroyed.
- 3) There are far more suitable sites for housing within the surrounding areas which do not have the same highway problems that are experienced in Lancing and Sompting.
- 4) There is also an abundance of wildlife within Sompting with many birds of prey and other varieties of birds, and once this fragile eco system is destroyed, it will be destroyed forever. There is so much to lose with the building of all these houses and that is why it must be rejected.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 752

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- The wildlife in the Brooks. We are already taking too much from them.
- The traffic situation is already a nightmare with traffic from the A27 through the village. Not being able to get out of the village.
- More houses mean more cars.
- This is the last green area between town, we need space.
- Suggest you convert empty premises into homes.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 597

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 598

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having been made aware of the planning application for West Sompting area, I will say here and now that I am totally opposed to such a development; not least of all for the over bearing pressure it will bring to our community, schooling, health and law requirements. This is along with a now totally over stressed A27 bypass and village roads, not only at rush hours, and the risk of possible flooding.

I have within the last year moved to what I consider to be my retirement home, purchased in the belief that the location is and would always be backing onto unspoilt land (Keep the Gaps); which supports such a vast array of wildlife far beyond my expectations (including birds on the RSPBs amber warning band).

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 733

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I totally object to these Plans as Sompting, being a village, cannot cope with the housing being proposed. The extra traffic this would entail would be overwhelming and the whole area would grind to a halt. The A27 has been a problem for a long time and it was never built to cope with the traffic now, let alone another extra 1000+ vehicles. The whole area will become a massive car park which is no exaggeration. You only have to live here and try to travel within the area to know the difficulty that the A27 causes. The A259 is also an extremely busy road and these are the only 2 roads which serve Sompting to travel in and out of the area. If one is shut for any reason, then the traffic just stops and then there is a massive build-up. Our quality of life will be diminished and we will become isolated due to the fact we will not be able to travel freely. Buses will also be affected by this extra traffic.

There will be extra pressure on local schools, doctors and Worthing hospital. Travelling to larger shopping centres such as Lyons Farm will become increasingly difficult. Travelling through Sompting Village is now an absolute nightmare. Drivers are diverting from the A27 to drive through this area with total disregard for the poor people that live there. With this large amount of extra traffic, it will become an impossible route in which to travel - making the A27 queues even longer. Sompting Village is a Conservation Area and now a complete rat run. This should never be allowed to continue. We should be preserving these areas as well as the wildlife that currently thrives in the region. Many birds of prey are seen within the area, as well as a large amount of other species of birds. Once these disappear that is it. We should now be saving the wildlife, not destroying it. The Plans will go a long way towards destroying Sompting and so that is why these proposals should be rejected.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 681

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 731

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

A development of 480 houses south, west and north of Loose Lane is completely unrealistic given the size of the school, the workload of the local surgery and the restricted width and state of disrepair which exists on the local roads. Potentially a further 1800 people would have to queue to get onto the A27 and share already gird-locked services.

We chose to live here because Sompting was a VILLAGE. This development will make us part of Worthing. Visit Loose Lane, West Street at 8-9am and 4.30-5.30pm and you will witness first hand why this development idea is not viable. It is too big.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 729

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: SOMPTING GAP GREEN SPACE.

Why can't the proposed developments be built on the old tip at the Halewick Lane alongside the new allotments, which I'm sure is not green belt or National Park at the moment. Also, it would stop illegal raves going on, of which there was only last week and they seem to be a regular occurrence!

I have lived in my house for 38 years this year and was told that the Green Gap/Sompting Gap would never be built on, which is one of the reasons we have stayed here and never sold our house. Not only does it flood all around when we have heavy rain, because of the natural spring coming from past the Marquis of Granby across the road and down the fields it has an abundance of wildlife.

The amount of traffic will be phenomenal and congest the already busy A27, of which they use West Street and beyond as a rat run at peak times or if there has been an accident. This happens on a regular basis. We do not want these built, nor do we need them or the hassle that comes with them.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 728

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 727

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Wildlife disturbnd. Drainage problem on flood land. Extra cars on West Street must be considered a stupid idea. Rush hour is busy enough now. West to Eastbound traffic wait for such a long time as priority is to East/West traffic from the A27. No one pays attention to give way signs at rush hou. Just too busy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 735

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly oppose building on flood plains. Come and see the traffic chaos through Sompting Village during peak times; if there is an accident on the A27 I am unable to get out!

Also, I am told that there is to be a travellers site. No no no!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 768

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The A27 is already impossible at any time of day with queues, West Street Sompting is used as a side route but it does not work and queues occur there too. Plus the people living there can hardly cross the road.  
We have flooding in Sompting after heavy rains - more buildings mean less land for the water to soak into.  
The Downs are very close to the buildings and the sea to the South; we are already a tight little village with a small space between us and Worthing.  
Why ruin what is just manageable. This project is not going to help. The other important fact is the wildlife and the land used for homes. Humans already treat animals dreadfully so what provision do you intend to make for birds, foxes, mice etc - all part of God's creation and important. What a terrible world with only humans on the planet. Trees are important to everyone - you should make them a priority and plant more, there is no indication on the plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 780

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Bad service now on buses. One an hour to Worthing via station. One an hour to the hospital.

As a result of this, have to stand on the first bus in the morning.

Too much traffic in West Street (it's a village) at peak times. Often speeding, not forgetting this is near Sompting village school. Children crossing West Street on way to school.

More houses will crowd village, doctors, roads and school. More cars on bypass.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 777

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The density of the housing would cause devastation in the West Street, Sompting area with people trying to get to work. A suggestion was made for it to be a one-way street, but you would still have a bottle neck getting on to the A27.

Until there is a by-pass with the A27 it will be a complete shambles.

How many young local couples will be able to afford the 'affordable homes' and will houses be ramped in like the Balltree Pub. Not enough parking spaces.

Only one post office for the whole area, and you have to queue there for ages, sometimes even outside. How will the post office accommodate the extra public?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 776

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Comments on Paras 2.67-2.80.

I am concerned that the SNCI should be disturbed by the proposed development. The habitat once disturbed will inevitably affect the wildlife and could be disastrous for driving it away never to return.

Access to West Street from the Loose Lane development will only exacerbate an already heavy traffic flow, at peak times, along West Street. At times the traffic already backs up from Church Lane to St. Mary's Close, caused by traffic rat running down Church Lane from the A27. It has taken me sometimes over 20 minutes to drive from St Mary's Close to the roundabout at the junction with the A24, a distance of approx 1 1/2 miles. The development at Loose Lane, which will only have on exit onto West Street, for 400 homes with all the inevitable increase in cars will cause an intolerable traffic burden on an already unacceptable situation.

The proposed area is already liable to flooding and any disturbance to the water table could affect the surrounding properties and could affect their insurance if they become liable to flooding. The water table in my existing property is only a few inches below the surface. I back onto Malt House Meadow, which readily floods when it rains heavily. I am concerned that any disturbance to the water table could cause the meadow to flood more often.

The increase in dwellings will place a further strain on the Ball Tree Surgery, where one already has to wait several days for an appointment (I have waited up to 10 days in the past for an appointment). The local schools are already full and the proposal to provide extra places in Lancing and East Worthing will only add to the traffic problem as parent will drive their children to school. The bus service has recently been reduced and because of the traffic it is often delayed.

Whilst the development off of Dankton Lane might be the more viable of the two, access to the site will still be difficult. Northwards out of Dankton Lane will be onto the A27 which will direct the traffic westwards, adding to the present congestion by Lyons Farm. Emerging eastwards via Rectory Farn Road will be difficult because of the cars parked all along the road. Access southwards onto West Street will add to the traffic which is unacceptable at peak times and will increase traffic through the conservation area.

Last year we were subject to a water shortage and the increase in population, this development will only exacerbate the situation further. Already we are being urged to reduce the amount of rubbish we produce and send to landfill sites again this can only increase.

I object to this proposed plan as being environmentally damaging, adding more traffic to an already congested road system, shortage of school places, the extra burden on the doctors surgery and the increase in domestic waste and the extra water supplies required.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 531

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 775

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although I understand more housing development is required in the area, OVER development will bring more problems that it is solving.

#### POLICY 6:

The flood zone, Cokeham Brooks, plus surrounding area MUST be protected from any new developments, as with all of the wildlife that live and visit here.

'If you take away natures home, there will be no nature'.

Like the proverbial 'pebble in the pond', any future development(s) will have far reaching consequences not just for Sompting, but for the wider area.

Please make sure that the 'pebble' is a little one!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 773

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The following points are my objections to the proposed building developments in Sompting, all of which impact on my personal day-to-day living and quality of life in Sompting Village.

- An already overstretched road system A27, West Street, Busticle Lane. West Street nearing total gridlock at times. All traffic including Emergency Vehicles and buses are being held-up now, so increasing the number of homes in the village is madness. The vast number of residents work outside the area and rely on the road network everyday.
- The proposed site for development is a 'Strategic Green Gap' and any development sets the precedence to fill up the gap resulting in Sompting Village losing community identity and wildlife. Proposing community Orchards and Green Buffers does not replace the established ecology.
- Flooding is already an issue especially with the Downs to the North and the sea to the South. Despite any proposed measure to reduce risks there can be no guarantee that existing adjacent homes [my home] would not be affected in future as a result of these proposals.
- Schools cannot cope now with the current primary child numbers.

Over half of Adur Council area is now National Parkland and the remainder squeezed between the National Park and the sea. What's left is a narrow corridor with two very busy east-west 'A' roads. The local A259 along the seafront passing through towns, hence slow and congested. The main A27 trunk road grinding to a halt most of the time. Hold-ups mentioned every day on radio traffic reports, but with no alternative routes - the Downs creating a barrier to close alternative routes for passing through traffic. So the A27 and surrounding cut-through roads gets continually worse.

The proposed development of homes will therefore negatively impact on our living conditions in the village.

I'm sure there are other areas of the county with better access roads and infrastructure that can easily accommodate the housing needs of West Sussex rather than decimate Sompting Village.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 772

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: REVISED ADUR DRAFT PLAN (SOMPTING).

Further to the public meeting chaired by Tim Loughton that highlighted the number of houses proposed in the Sompting Green Gap, I now reflect on the proposed housing development in Sompting Village in 2011. When fortunately our local planning department wisely rejected the building of 14 houses, the applicant appealed that decision and again the appeal was dismissed.

There were a number of issues that the appeal inspector raised, one of the issues was against any development in certain particular sensitive areas of the countryside including those referred to in LP Policy AC4, which relates to defined strategic gaps and secondly that effect on highway safety and emergency services.

Now we learn and strongly oppose of the proposal to build 480 houses within this strategic green gap. The infrastructure in this area makes this totally unsustainable. Therefore I hope the planning department can stop any reduction of the very important verdant character of the area that makes Sompting uniquely placed on the South Coast.

A further issue that it is still causing congestion through the village is the amount of traffic that comes off of the A27 at Sompting. Most of this is vehicles whose drivers just want to avoid the bottle neck at Lyon's Farm and no thought or consideration for our village. An inexpensive solution to this problem would be to make the top of Church Lane one way, with no entry off of the A27, thus improving the quality of village life and improving road safety for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and other road users.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 771

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act and the spirit of openness, please advise whether any member of Adur District Council (particularly the planning committee) and the staff actually live within 500 (five hundred meters) of the proposed Sompting developments.

Presumably most of the proposers will have passed on in the next five years - and the back lash will on their successors to deal with.

Do you know how parts of the North Sompting site now flood?

What will happen to the electricity pylons, do people enjoy living with them?

Where will the children be taught (9 years)?

West street cannot be calmed - Sompting Village can just about cope now, with your developments it will grind to a halt many times during the day - mission impossible.

Details of the benefits to the existing residents will not materialise.

Surely Withy Patch site could be extended to accommodate 'travellers' - then you only have one site to deal with easy access to the A27.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 750

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I strongly object to the proposed 80 houses being built behind where I live. There is no adequate infrastructure for the proposed houses and I don't believe that even the proposed measures will be anywhere near what is required. The A27 is already vastly overcrowded and congested. People use Dankton Lane, Church Lane and West Street as a rat run. These roads are full to breaking point. The existing traffic calming measures on West Street do not work. It is a complete free for all leading to huge delays and back logs and can in no way support the proposed number of extra vehicles, let alone the current amount on these local narrow roads.

I object to the proposed noise and air pollution. I live in Sompting for the peace and quiet, the space, the views, the calm way of life and the character of Sompting. This proposed development, in addition to the Loose Lane proposal, will destroy this and is unwanted.

I do not want to look out onto or back onto an 80 house development, as I chose this area for my health, my well-being, mental state and medical conditions. This development will cause me long term suffering, mental illness and a reversal of all of the progress that I have been able to achieve since living here. I live here for the nature and the wildlife. This will all be ruined and there is no need for an 'artificial' man-made orchard. There are not enough health facilities at the moment and transport has been cut. Therefore, I have no faith that this proposal will provide the adequate amount to support this and that the existing services will be further undermined.

This is a threat to my way of life, to the reason I live here and to the Sompting Village. I will continue to oppose such measures with as much vigour as my health allows.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 770

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having seen the plans displayed at the H. J. Centre and attended the Tim Loughton meeting, I am truly appalled by the scale of the proposal in the plan. Whilst appreciating that there is a long term requirement for providing housing in the area, it is completely misguided and OTT. My major concern, as a West Street resident of over 35 years, is that of traffic. I am sure that I hardly need to reiterate the already existing problems at periods during the day, but this plan would only hugely worsen the situation. The road system, let alone all the medical, educational and other systems, cannot stand this degree of exploding of housing in this area.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 751

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 765

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Why on earth have the council decided to go with the proposal to build houses on this site. In the initial draft option A 1785 homes and option B 2635. Why choose the highest amount? The village is full to the brim already, the traffic in rush hours is a nightmare from cars dropping off the A27 into West Street. The schools are already full to capacity. It takes ages to get a doctor's appointment. There just isn't work for the additional people in the proposed houses in the village. So they would have to drive out of the area creating even more traffic. The fields behind our house give us amazing views and add avlue to our home. As a home owner, who is going to compensate me for the devaluation of my property?

Sompting Estates appear to have already done a deal with the property developer reading Sompting. If this draft is approved then questions need to be raised about the integrity of those giving permission. Who is in who's pocket? Aren't councillors supposed to represent the residents? They are not on the council to line their own pockets. We do not want this development in any shape or form. This is not about HAVING to build homes in Adur, it is about Sompting Estates wanted to sell and develop the land to line their pockets and sod everyone who lives in the village.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 761

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sirs,

Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013.

At a meeting held to consider the above, about 180-200 residents of Sompting attended at the Sompting Village School on Saturday, 28th October.

At the meeting most were unaware of the consultation, which started in September, until reading about the above meeting in the Herald. This does not give much time to respond and make other Sompting residents aware of the proposals in the Plan.

However, my comments mainly relate to Revised Draft Policy 6: Land at West Sompting. The proposal to build 480 dwellings north and south of West Street is nonsense. 480 houses, approximately 1100-1200 residents, approximately 900 cars and vans. How is the infrastructure of the village of Sompting going to cope - will it become part of an unbroken line of development along the coast (development cannot go north because of the National Park). Will children have to go to school some distance away, even outside of the District? Will the new residents have to travel to get to a doctor, dentist, post office, work etc all of which will require transport.

The leads to the next point - the road network.

The A27 is gridlocked and is getting worse by the year. In the last forty years there has been two public enquiries costing millions of pounds. In both cases the enquiries were held the inspector reported his recommendation to the appropriate Minister and in both cases the Government of the day said that they could not afford the scheme and it was not of high enough priority. Properties that were bought along the A27 by the Department of Transport over the years were then sold on to developers making it now impossible to just widen the highway. So in the last 40 years nothing has changed.

Now on to West Street. The road is used as a rat run to try and by-pass the daily traffic jams on the A27. The powers that decided the best way to deal with this was to put in pinch points, speed humps and staggered car parking making most of the road a single lane carriageway. Has it made any difference - NO. There is more traffic using West Street because of the problems on the A27.

As I'm sure we all know, nothing will be done in the next 20 years to alleviate the highway problems apart from minor improvements. The money will not be there!

So if the Local Plan is in operation for about the same period, surely putting forward a proposal for 480 dwellings in the areas shown cannot be viable until the highways are sorted out. West Street and surrounding roads will be even more congested and it is probable that residents would have difficulty getting off of their estates.

Other points are the village losing its identity, environmental concerns, flooding, wildlife etc - all things raised at the meeting.

One concern that came to light at the meeting was the areas concerned are owned by Sompting Estates and it has an agreement with a developer

that they can build on the land if and when planning permission is approved. Were the planners aware of this? Unfortunately there were no planners at the meeting to ask.

At the meeting not a single person got up and said that the policy put forward was a good idea. We are sure that if more Sompting residents were aware of the Plan they would also be against it, particularly the housing element. We will not go into the comments about traffic congestion in West Street, Busticle Land and the A27 as it is now and for that proposed - apart to say they were not good.

It is accepted that housing will have to be provided for the future. But to try and fit so many houses between the sea and the National Park in what is already a heavy urbanised area along this part of the coast does not seem sensible or right.

For the reasons given above, we wish to put forward our objection to the Revised Draft Policy 6: Land at West Sompting, especially in relation to housing and transport.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 760

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Strongly object to the presence of a travellers site in the area. Would be no good for residents having to live with, house prices would drop dramatically. If you feel the need to have such sites, then they should be far away from any residential areas.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 759

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I think that 480 more homes in Sompting is too many! Police, fire, ambulance, etc (infrastructure) is already stretched to the limit. Traffic on the A27 is already crowded! More houses equals more traffic. I already feel trapped by the A27 and South Downs (when I get to them) in the North, the River Adur crossings in the East and West by the A27 congestion in Worthing and in the South by the sea.

The smaller local roads are already used as a cut through, effectively blocking them at peak times. There are already empty shops and industrial units, why build more?

You can wait in A&E corridors for 24 hours to be admitted to a ward. Not good for the many elderly people living in the area.

Why consider building on a green field site when the migrating birds and other wildlife need space and access inland, over non-polluted ground, in winter.

From my home it can take 1/2 an hour to access the A27, without the time taken once on the A27, meaning extra time on a journey.

It is my understanding that there are underground springs in the West Street area, and fields around where the building is planned.

I moved to Sompting in 2001, for clean, fresh air and the countryside - not to be polluted by traffic fumes on an overcrowded road which is often at a standstill. More houses equals more cars on an already overcrowded road in a small area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 756

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

These areas are all part of a flood plain. Further building will cause major flooding.

Let's think about the infrastructure now!

No more building.

Think about the birds, animals, views and walks. Look elsewhere for further housing.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 755

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We do need housing I agree, but not until a new bypass or improvements to the A27 so that West Street stops being a rat run for cars and lorries, as new housing on this site will make it worse.

I do object to this proposal.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 754

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I do agree that we need more houses, but not until we put a new bypass and stop the rat run in West Street. If not, it will make the situation a lot worse.

I do object to it a great deal.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 753

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Being a resident since 1985, I was horrified to see the proposed development plans for Sompting, and in particular the land opposite my house. Dankton Lane is already frequently a rat run for traffic escaping from the A27 (which is so often traffic-bound from the A24 roundabout up to at least the end of this lane). This causes another traffic jam along West Street, which is a nightmare to drive through, let alone walk!

I bought my house for its favourable position, the Council Tax reflecting this. This is a 'lane' not built for heavy traffic. No doubt if these plans go ahead, the value of our houses will drop drastically and the disruption will not only be unbearable, but the infrastructure for such a confined area will be unsustainable. 'Sompting Village' will be irrevocably lost forever!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 730

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

A housing development south, west and north of Loose Lane will substantially reduce the green gap between Sompting and Worthing and nullify the idea of a Sompting Village.

A development of 480 houses in a large development will put a strain on the local infrastructure, including schools, health centres and recreational facilities.

We have seen over the years an increase in traffic along West Street, not only during rush hours but also at other times of the day. West Street, despite the speed bumps and restricted flow, is used as a 'rat run' to avoid the A27 bypass traffic. The proposal for 480 houses off of Loose Lane indicates a possible 480+ cars that can only add to the traffic flow problems through the 'village' of Sompting.

A smaller development of housing, leaving some of the farmland around Loose Lane intact, would be a better solution and help the local schools, health centre and recreational facilities to cope with the new situation.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 202

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

PRECEDENT. A previous Planning Application for 14 residence in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a Government Inspector (Feb 2011), 1) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and 2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting village.

HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS. Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat-runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriage INCREASED TRAFFIC HAZARDS. Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows, at over 800 cars per hour.

PARKING. The exit road from these proposed development would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/West Street and environs.

LOSS OF CONSERVATION AREA. Since the mid - 1970's, West Sussex County Council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.

REDUCED STRATEGIC GAP. This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.

VILLAGE LIFE. This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life; 480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 601

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 697

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My main objection to this development is the impact on our road system. The A27 and West Street are already too congested and this will exasperate the situation.

First should be a bypass... THEN build more houses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 698

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The strain on infrastructure (doctors and schools) will be enormous.

My main objection is the effect that it will have on our already overcrowded roads. Driving along West Street and the A27 is already horrendous and this will only make congestion worse in this area. First build a bypass then build more houses.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 693

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No more building on our flood plain. The flood plain protects our homes. Any more building on it and we will end up flooding. How can more development be considered.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 726

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to all aspects of the proposed 480 housing development behind Loose Lane and Malthouse Close respectively. It is ill-advised and completely unsustainable.

Sompting cannot support such an intense housing development. The A27 and West Street cannot cope with the existing traffic. The West Street traffic calming measures are ineffective. There are no facilities, shops or jobs to support the expansion. The bus services have already been cut, the 7 and 7a have also reduced too. The surface water already collects too much to support any further building. The environment is paramount to this area and will be decimated by the building work and an offer of an 'artificial' community orchard. The quality of living and peaceful environment that was the reason I live here will be lost. 480 homes could equate to over 700 vehicles, which is unsustainable. Over 50% of the district is National Park, which vastly reduces our ability to support such an extensive proposed development. Smaller individually financed developments spread throughout the area over 20 years is the only visible possibility.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 700

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

RE: Local Plan.

I have recently seen the local plan where there is a proposal to build 1000 new homes in the Lancing/Sompting area. I wondered if anybody had given this proposal some serious thought about the practicalities and consequences of such a large development; or is the proposal just blindly going along with central government guidelines.

The area already suffers from chaotic gridlock at morning and evening peak times. Weekends also have their chaotic periods.

To increase the housing stock by this scale will require serious improvement to traffic flow through the area - a bypass would be the only real option.

Also, look at the destruction in recent years through flooding in areas where development has been carried out on flood plains. Do we really want the same problem to arise in our area?

I would hope that the local council will reject the proposals outright.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 704

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP.

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 691

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 690

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 710

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 695

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Traffic access?

Flooding!

The A27/A259 blocked up with cars and lorries. We need a bypass for Lancing and Worthing.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 689

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 3) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 4) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 5) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 6) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 712

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I support the building of 80 houses, but not the 480!

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 3) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 4) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 5) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 6) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 723

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 600

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

KEEP THE GAPS ON THE MAP:

Stop flood-risked development on New Monks Farm and on both Lancing and Sompting Strategic Green Gaps.

Planning applications are going ahead despite residents' warnings that this will create significant flooding risks. Last winter, severe flooding damaged a number of homes in the area, and stopped circulation of traffic, at great cost to the community. Our roads, schools and hospitals are already congested and at full capacity.

The Gaps, which are so important to wild life as well as our quality of life, are being eroded. 'Action plans' are not enough - this development must stop. The A27 cannot cope as it is with the 1000+ extra cars pouring onto it. Sussex reservoirs were almost dry a short time ago so how can the Water company cope with over 1,000 extra homes requiring water supply and sewage disposal, not to mention the provision of schools, nurseries, jobs, doctors and dentists, policing, recreation spaces, etc. - the whole infrastructure in fact. This is already creaking at the seams, so how can we cope with more people.

This is not NIMBYism, it is common sense!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 725

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am seriously concerned about the large increase in traffic the houses will bring. West Street is already used as a rat run and even the traffic calming has done little to help. If extra housing is added at Dankton Lane/Loose Lane, then there is potential for over 1000 extra cars, creating even more of a congestion. Added to this severe lack of parking spaces, traffic pollution and even more pressure on an already overloaded road/by-pass.

RE building on a flood zone:

The roads, fields and streets in this area have already been seriously affected by flooding since the beginning of the year (and years before that). The existing water mains/sewerage won't be able to cope with the extra pressure created by 480+ houses. The drains in this area cannot cope as it is. The flooding caused major road damage along West Street (particularly by the Marquis of Granby) and the additional traffic created will put even more wear and tear on these roads.

As well as my objections to the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan listed above, I also wish to raise these points:-

- Sompting will have very little, if none, in the way of green field sites left if these planned homes are built.
- It will no longer be a village as we will technically be joined to Worthing and Lancing either side.
- There will be a massive strain on our doctors, hospital, schools, fire services, policing - these are already over--stretched.
- Will there be enough policing, fire cover, etc to cope with the 1000+ people moving into the area?
- We will lose the bio-diversity from Malthouse Meadows/surrounding area and the reed beds by Ullswater Close.
- Does the proposed building of 480+ homes set a precedent for even more additional building later on surrounding land.
- The transport links are bad already with a very much reduced bus service (No. 7), which doesn't run in the evening/on Sundays. Will you be increasing this if you build these homes?
- The schools will be pushed to accept all the additional children arriving in the area. This will mean an increase in class sizes/3 form entry etc. plus extra classrooms needed.
- The major issue of where is all the traffic going to go if there is a serious incident on the by-pass/West Street/Western Road. It is already a problem with traffic at a standstill and cars unable to go any other way when an accident occurs.
- Lack of shops to accommodate the extra people as well as not enough work/jobs for the locals.
- Houses are already too expensive for people who live in the area - particularly for first time buyers. How is this going to help them?

Overall, I strongly object to these plans, and I hope that you will take time to read through everyone's objections and consider them carefully.

The Sompting that we moved to 19 years ago, because of the open space/countryside, will be lost forever if we allow all of these homes to be built.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 615

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 688

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

What about provisions for schools??

- 1) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 2) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 3) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 4) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 5) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 6) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 715

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
  - 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
  - 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
  - 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
  - 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
  - 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
  - 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 687

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

- 1) Precedent.....A previous planning application for 14 residences in Sompting was dismissed on appeal by a government inspector (Feb 2011) due to adverse effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the countryside and (2) the effect on highway safety and the free flow of traffic through Sompting Village .
- 2) Highways and access.....Church Lane, Dankton Lane and West Street are notorious rat- runs for traffic heading west off the A27 dual carriageway.
- 3) Increased traffic hazards.....Vehicles 'exiting' this residential development have no priority over the West Street traffic flows , at over 800 cars per hour.
- 4) Parking....The exit road from these proposed developments would adversely affect current residents who have to park their cars on the road in Loose Lane/ West Street and environs.
- 5) Loss of Conservation Area.....Since the mid 1970's, West Sussex County council and Adur District Council have clearly defined the Village of Sompting as a Conservation Area.
- 6) Reduced Strategic Gap.....This development is an infringement of the strategic gap, detrimental to the amenity and cohesion of village community.
- 7) Village Life.....This development would have an irrecoverable effect on the village life....480 new dwellings would very significantly increase the population of the village itself; especially building houses on a known flood plain.
- 

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 720

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to the building in West Street, Sompting as the very limited access from West Street to the A27 is an accident waiting to happen. There is not the infrastructure in place for the building, e.g. schools for the impending families. I do wonder how much of the land is flood plain as we are already seeing flooding in parts of Lancing that we never had before.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 06: West Sompting

Reference No. 722

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The building of 480 homes at Loose Lane (which I believe is a flood plain) and Dankton Lane will exacerbate the traffic flow, especially through Sompting Village and the West Street/Busticle Lane junction. 480 houses and possibly an extra 1,000 cars.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.87**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.87

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority wishes to see greater reference made in paras 2.57 and 2.87 regarding the roundabout options on the A27 to minimising the potential landscape impact of the proposals and that the existing evidence in suggests that the eastern option is the more sensitive location in landscape terms, and indeed is immediately adjacent to the South Downs National Park.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.87

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the reference in para.2.87 to identifying that whichever roundabout option is delivered it will be essential to ensure that safe and improved pedestrian and cycle access across the A27 to the South Downs National Park is provided.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.87

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Change for roundabout instead of lights on A27 is not feasible based on traffic usage, plus the current spate of accidents within that stretch of roadway. Unless the lights are staying and roundabout extra but that would put 2 roundabouts within less than 1/2 mile and the queues would prove more problematic than at moment. Also visitors to Lancing College.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.87

Reference No. 969

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Northbrook College

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support the work being done to secure early progress on flood defences as part of the Greater Brighton City Deal and the ideas behind the Shoreham Growth Hub.

With regards to the need to upgrade the Sussex Pad Junction, which is essential for the hub to be viable and to encourage more airport users and visitors, we make the following comments:

- East west access on both sides of the junction is essential for both the needs of the Airport, Northbrook staff and students and Ricardo as well as those of Lancing College and others using the Coombes Road and for access to the National Park.

- The junction needs to be as far east as is possible, noting runway approach issues and design constraints of the dome and travellers site - complex and long access roads will materially increase inconvenience to airport users and visitors and reduce development viability.

We wish to see improved sustainable transport access to the airport and would support an on airport bus route and also note the need for west bound cycle routes along the A27 in to Worthing which need to be in place as soon as possible - both these would reduce parking pressure on the airport. Improved pedestrian access to the South east corner is also need for the many students and other users who come from Shoreham. With increased residential and employment development on and around the airport looking for a rail station for the airport would be helpful.

Improved access to the A259 is also needed.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.92**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.92

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references in para.2.92 to the area making a strong contribution to the impression of open, extensive greenspace in the green gap, enhancing the separation between Shoreham and Lancing and providing a striking landscape setting, and that the landscape survey assesses the overall landscape sensitivity of Shoreham Airport as high.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.93**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.93

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references in para.2.93 to it being essential that the open character of the area is retained and key views from within the National Park, such as Lancing Ring and Mill Hill to the airport and terminal building, and other key views, are protected.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.97**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Para 2.97

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority wishes to see greater reference made in paras 2.57 and 2.87 regarding the roundabout options on the A27 to minimising the potential landscape impact of the proposals and that the existing evidence in suggests that the eastern option is the more sensitive location in landscape terms, and indeed is immediately adjacent to the South Downs National Park.

---



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 985

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Apollo Aviation Advisory Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing both as a resident of North Lancing and as an existing business based at Shoreham Airport.

Objections to the draft local plan on grounds which apply equally to Draft Policy 4, 5 and 7 are:

A) The Adur District is constrained physically by the South Downs National Park to the North and the Sea to the South. The A27 and the A259 are already heavily congested at certain times. The congestion on the A27 west bound starts at the North Lancing Roundabout but the root of the cause is further West as traffic has to negotiate the Hill Barn cross roads, Lyons Farm traffic lights, the A27 capacity halving to a single carriageway (in effect until west of Worthing) and the Grove Lodge roundabout. The reverse applies eastbound. It is hard to see how this situation can be changed without building a by-pass in the National Park, an obviously remote outcome. Unless land is reclaimed from the sea, an even more unlikely prospect, there appears to be little possibility of significantly improving the A259. The proposed new roundabout, wherever situated, may provide better and safer access to the proposed developments, but will only add to the traffic on the A27 and potentially slow down the flow of cross traffic. Therefore:

- i) The proposed developments will lead to totally unacceptable levels of traffic on the A27 making the area less attractive to both residents and businesses;
- ii) The proposed developments would lead to increased pollution and damage to the environment caused by the exhausts of queuing traffic.

B) Both developments lead to an erosion of the Green Gap between Shoreham and Lancing leading to a further loss of the attractiveness of Adur to existing and potential residents.

C) Both proposed developments are in flood zones, not all tidal, which unless carefully managed will cause flooding to existing properties. As has already been demonstrated on a number of occasions recently to the discomfort of residents.

Objection to Draft Policy 7.

Paragraph 2.84 of the draft Local Plan dealing with Shoreham Airport states:

"The operators of the Airport consider that new development on this site is essential to ensure its long-term viability, particularly given the overall reduction in flights over the last 10 years. Commercial property is a key source of income for the Airport in addition to aviation and leisure activities. However, it will be important to ensure that adequate provision is made for aviation-related development to support its viability."

It is understood that the commercial buildings and development rights at the Airport are owned by a completely separate company to the Airport Operating Company. If this understanding is correct it is hard to see how the long term viability of the Airport Operating Company would be improved by any development. The present infrastructure has supported much higher levels of the type of aviation related activities likely to improve

the viability of the Airport Operating Company than is being achieved at the present whilst the addition of laundries and call centres tenuously connect to the travel industry only provide rental income to the owners of the commercial properties and development rights.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear All,

Here's another good reason why never to build on a flood plain. Please see today's BBC report in the link.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-north-east-wales-24810900>

The salient points from the story of the Glasdir Estate in Wales have been picked out. There are some very telling sentences here which is why these paragraphs have been selected. Never mind where the flooding occurs, the issues are true of any homes built on flood plains anywhere in the UK. Adur District Councillors should 'read, mark, learn and inwardly digest' and then pass on the facts to Government if they are challenged about why they should not build on flood plains.

There are other cases as I mentioned at the cabinet meeting, Redcar in September, St Asaph, also in Denbighshire to name but two others. Adur must use these examples to protect the community from similar disasters.

Once again, New Monks Farm and the Airport are on a flood plain – Adur must exclude these from the plan

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 35

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Where possible the floodplain should be protected. A through road could also be made through from Sussex Pad and the roundabout to relieve the heavily congested A27 and A259.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 27

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Building this idiotic and crazy concrete dam including the building of large units on the airport is absolutely crazy. With all the industrial space that Lancing has in abundance already. It will become a haven for lorries and even more road problems - and further congestion!

Adur DC must listen to all of us who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas into the New Year. This level of problem must never be allowed to happen again.

If the A27 was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes a number of years ago, how can the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed be acceptable to the Highways Agency??!. Together with the proposed roundabout. This is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council has no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its rate paying residents.

If the plan, as it is, is put forward to the government inspector without the above exclusions, then our councillors and authority officers have totally failed the local community.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 63

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The north eastern side of the airport is used during the winter months by several hundred lapwing and other waders that roost and forage in this exact location as it is currently the quietest and least disturbed corner of the airfield. Lapwings are a species of conservation concern due to loss of habitat therefore I disagree with proposal to develop this area of the airport.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 984

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation CPRE Sussex Countryside Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Paragraphs 2.87 – 2.95 of the Revised Draft Local Plan identify a number of environmental and infrastructure constraints to the development of the land at Shoreham Airport:

- Access: direct on the already heavily congested A27, via a new roundabout (potentially together with the traffic associated with the proposed development at New Monks Farm).
- Flooding: the airport is located within Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain). The airport is at risk from tidal and fluvial flooding and has a high susceptibility to groundwater flooding.
- Landscape impact: The Landscape and Ecological Survey of Key Sites Within the Adur District assesses the site as making ‘a strong contribution to the impression of open, extensive greenspace in the Lancing-Shoreham Local Green Gap, enhancing the sense of separation between Shoreham and Lancing and providing a striking landscape setting for the lower stretches of the River Adur as it winds towards the sea’. The Survey assesses the overall landscape sensitivity of Shoreham Airport as “high”.

Access: the A27 is already at overcapacity and yet the Plan proposes access direct from the proposed developments at New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport on to it. The introduction of a new roundabout along this section would be an obstacle to existing traffic flows, both through traffic and local traffic. The resulting further congestion would not improve local residents’ quality of life nor enhance the economic attractiveness of Adur for new businesses.

Flooding: paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework states ‘Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.’ The Revised Draft Local Plan recognises the high vulnerability of the Airport to flooding.

CPRE Sussex therefore considers that development at Shoreham Airport would not achieve clause V9 of the Vision – that ‘flood risk will have been greatly reduced through..... the careful consideration of the location of new development’ – and would be contrary to paragraph 100 of the Framework.

Landscape impact: the Landscape and Ecological Survey of Key Sites Within the Adur District recognises and emphasises the high landscape sensitivity of the Airport. It is also highly visually sensitive. CPRE Sussex is concerned that additional development on the Airport, away from the present concentration of buildings limited to the southern edge, would be highly visible, significantly detract from the openness and greenness of the Airport, detract from the setting of the River Adur (contrary to Revised Draft Policy 11) and potentially detrimentally impact on the views between Shoreham and the Airport and the South Downs and Lancing College.

The Sustainability Appraisal notes the potential for conflict with a number of objectives including water quality, biodiversity, the countryside, historic environment, green infrastructure, pollution and minimising flood risk. The policy requirements may “mitigate” these conflicts, but will not overcome them entirely. Given these significant environmental and infrastructure impacts, CPRE Sussex does not see how development at Shoreham Airport can possibly be considered to be “sustainable”, given the National Planning Policy Framework’s explanation ‘to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously’ (paragraph 8) and ‘Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life’ (paragraph

9). CPRE Sussex therefore objects to Revised Draft Policy 7.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I am in my late seventies and have lived in Lancing since early Sixties. What Adur District Council is proposing within their strategic 16 year plan fills me with absolute trepidation.

Where I live, many of the residents are in similar situation and age group. There is tremendous concern at the proposal to build further development on the Lancing & Shoreham flood plain. Surely, last Christmas's event where in north and south Lancing the community suffered so badly for so long with flooded roads, gardens, homes with loss of toilet facilities and in the case of Grinstead Lane, even gas, is proof enough of the absolute stupidity of even contemplating this housing and business development on this slow draining flood plain.

Any infilling of concrete on New Monks Farm and the airport areas will inhibit the natural flow of surface and ground waters across this very shallow flood plain for all areas around the plain. Even the new football complex could suffer.

From the last event, it is obvious that the drainage network is not coping now particularly with the increasing trend for frequent, heavier, more prolonged wet weather. No matter what the expert say about mitigation for drainage, we who live here know instinctively this will never be possible.

It is well documented that they've said it about other locations in the UK and allowed buildings in similar situations to the heavy cost of new homeowners who have no recourse for compensation from either the developer or the authority. Insurance for the 600 homes and businesses will become impossible to obtain and as result procurement of mortgages.

What's the point of building properties where no one can obtain a mortgage!??

I insist that this proposal to build on the above areas must be categorically omitted from the authority's plan and the reasons why defended vigorously to the government inspectors.

The same applies to the proposed inclusion of a new roundabout on the A27. I am aghast at the fact that the Highways Agency are happy to agree to this when they objected 7 years ago to 100 houses being build on the same area because of the effect on this over capacity trunk road. Yet the increase of traffic flows from 600 homes and businesses is now acceptable??!!

I have absolutely no confidence in their professional opinion having seen the devastation from what was to be a 3 month improved drainage works on the same stretch of the A27, the outcome of which created the worst flooding ever experienced on this over busy trunk road.

Residents exiting Grinstead Lane, the Old Shoreham Road, Manor Road and Manor Close have extreme difficulties now. This proposed addition will make it not only considerably more difficult but extremely dangerous.

This roundabout must never happen.

We elected our councillors to look after our interests. In term of this plan they have failed miserably to do so to even allow it to go to public consultation with these severe risk elements included let alone their appalling communication of it to the public.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

## 1. Policy 5, Policy 7 - Objections

Unacceptable, increased Flood Risk, Decline in Community Wellbeing, Unsustainability

Our message to Adur District Council is absolutely clear.

There must be absolutely no further development on the green areas in the Lancing Shoreham Gap

Of course we recognise the need for an adopted, sound plan for Adur. But, we have had two months' experience of the sheer hell caused by drainage issues last Christmas into New Year.

We wrote and warned of these risks at the last consultation even before that Christmas event.

The management and remedial costs of the Christmas flooding emergency has cost the ratepayers hundreds of thousands of pounds.

For this revised plan even with the known Christmas/New Year drainage disaster, our comments have been completely ignored.

We ask, is this authority happy to let the Christmas experience be repeated as a regular occurrence and with even greater risk to our wellbeing and inevitable damage to our properties and our families' lives? We are greatly concerned at the proposals in hand.

We know and understand intuitively, better than anyone, the fragility, of the drainage in this highly sensitive area. Just over a metre drainage fall across the two miles of flood plain should say it all.

Old Salts Farm has been excluded from the plan, - and quite rightly so. Even so, whatever is developed in the north on NMF & Airport will still impact the drainage for the whole flood plain area – upstream and downstream. It is all interconnected. Just ask your drainage technical management. Even West Beach and Willowbrook in the south will be affected. If Old Salts is excluded because of drainage risks, then exactly the same should apply to the NMF and airport developments. If not those areas in the south and all around the plain will still suffer.

Issues from the 'Golf Course'

The drainage fall across the unfinished 'golf course' itself (where at least 60% of the NMF development would be located) is 65mm, less than 3 inches across that whole area of 173 acres!

(See planning application, Stuart Michael Associates consulting engineer's report, March 2006 – item 3.5).

This consultant also highlighted concerns with flood risk to Manor Close to the west of the site. He was certainly correct, as proved by the dreadful Christmas experience and that is after all the 12 mitigation ponds and ditch improvements to the golf course site supposedly should had been done, as required by the planning consent.

Manor Close also had flooding in 2010 as a direct result of lack of ditch clearance on the 'golf course'. Adur drainage engineers had to intervene with the Environment Agency. One of the affected Manor Close residents was refused flood risk insurance as a result of flooding to their property. At that event, there was also water drainage back up upstream to the west with badly water logged gardens. Studying GPS maps for 2012, there is

no trace of the 12 drainage ponds– if not, why on earth not? They were a crucial element in the mitigation for the drainage of the site and to prevent issues for the community locally both up and down stream.

Who is monitoring this development? It has run well over the 5 years of construction projected, has been filled with all sorts of hardcore and rubbish. Does anyone have the data on what volumes/types of fill have been dumped on the site compared to the planning consent?

The land profile has changed dramatically in height but there appears to be no mitigating ponds which were stipulated by the developer's design engineer and approved by the Environment Agency and Adur.

We understand there are also 2 sluices on the perimeter of the site to maintain levels in the ditches in Summer for wild life and which should be lifted in Winter to allow suitable drainage in the wetter season. Who is monitoring this takes place as required by the planning approval?

Why has all this not been stringently monitored in such a sensitive drainage situation?

There is no doubt that lack of mitigation ponds will have been a major contributor to the Christmas issues here in the North.

A flood plain is what it says it is. An area which can be allowed to flood in times of prolonged wet weather. Let alone having permitted already the existing 'golf course' and football complex, the proposed filling of the area with concrete and roads, will create even worse ground water and surface water drainage problems for not only the existing population but, if built, those 600 houses and businesses prospectively planned for the area. Are they viable if they cannot obtain flood risk insurance and are they even saleable. No insurance, no mortgage!

A further concern – next time there is such an event it can only be a lot worse than the one in 2012/2013. Now Southern Water will shortly have sealed all the faulty sewers which were inundated by the Christmas flood event – if such an event is allowed to occur again, there will be no relief possible by pumping the sewers into tankers. And as the Environment Agency have said – you cannot pump ground water, so the issues will be even greater than before.

Even West Sussex County Council's overpumping test from the key ditch which outfalls into the sluices at Shoreham and then into the river Adur using heavy duty fire service pumps made absolutely no impact on drainage levels across the flood plain. This confirms once again that these developments are futile and unmitigatable,

The Environment Agency who has published that a 75% surface and groundwater flood risk applies to these code 3 areas unbelievably has, despite this, indicated that drainage risk can be mitigated for!

This mitigation, we know from a sequential test document which has come to hand, is based upon ratings applied by the EA. Most of NMF is in a 3a area with a high probability of flooding. But this does not take into account the very evident climate change with longer heavier periods of rain. The whole area is already a site at the very highest risk of flooding.

If they had taken into account the severe drainage problems here in Winter 2012/2013, there is no way they could even contemplate mitigation for surface and groundwater drainage. Water levels were above ground level and no amount of mitigation would have coped as we all know here in North Lancing from the Christmas experience.

The same document also proposed that the areas of less flood risk in the development of the New Monks Farm should be allocated to business

development and the areas of greater risk to house and community build! Just how irresponsible is that!

In another part of the UK, the Environment Agency stated that mitigation was in place because of the improved river barrier enhancements at St Asaph in Denbysire. Earlier this year, two months after moving into the new Taylor Woodrow development, 250 St Asaph homes were under 6 feet of water with Taylor Woodrow whingeing that they were assured by the authorities that it was an area of safe build – despite their ultimate responsibility under planning law.

Last year, another flood plain build at Glasdir also in Denbighshire resulted in 122 homes being flooded with all the local authority blaming poor culvert design and stating that the homes met the Environment Agency specification for floor levels.

In September, Redcar on Teeside experienced serious homes flooding where a 'cure all' super SUDS sewage/surface water containment facility was shown to be totally incapable of coping with just 2 days heavy rain. 60 homes and roads were severely flooded, almost with loss of life.

What recourse do the affected communities have from the authorities or the developers in these situations? None – yet their lives have been ruined because of the negligence of the agencies and authorities responsible.

This is exactly the same situation here in Lancing for all areas in and around the flood plain.

For situations like ours in Adur, our residents have absolutely no confidence in the ability of the agencies/developers to provide the answers - or indeed for SUDS containment to be a proven solution to the drainage problems for this extremely fragile drainage area.

We know and have read that SUDS containment is part of the plan and view this with great alarm. New Monks Farm Development Ltd could not even get the area outline correct for the revised plan. They had included in their site outline a property owned by one of our residents and a recreation park owned by the council on the Mash Barn Estate!

What price they could ever come up with any solution to mitigate the drainage problem??!!

It appears they even have not bothered to build the 12 drainage ponds which were approved and stipulated as being essential for drainage mitigation for the water courses and third parties around it! Their consultant's specification - not the authorities.

Irrespective, with any further building we know there is no foolproof mitigation to guarantee elimination of increased drainage risk to our communities, let alone in the volume proposed.

Issues for the BH&A Complex

It has been noted that quite heavy waterlogging is already taking place on the site where the football training complex is located. This after only intermittent rain over the last few weeks.

As warned by this Network's objections to the extended site application – we feel sure that if the wet weather continues, even the club will have issues, in fact from what has been noted, it has them already. What price the prospective 600 houses to the North of the club. Yet more proof that they should not be built on this overburdened flood plain which is having trouble coping now – and, although academic, neither for that matter should the football training complex or 'golf course' have been permitted in this sensitive drainage area either.

The real impact on the drainage for the area from the club development has yet to be experienced. The data from 5 boreholes across the site to prove the levels of construction to be above the water table have been totally unobtainable to date - from the club, the Environment Agency or the local authority. Why is this information not visible to the public or, does it show that this development is flawed in terms of interrupted flows of the water table across its site? As this is being written, West Beach are experiencing the worst flooded roads ever seen by residents and it's worsening. There is only one thing that has changed to affect water flows across the flood plain – the Albion football complex which is now well advanced..

The NPPF says that where there are flood risk areas, other areas should be sought for development. Because of the limitations caused by local geography, we recognise there is limited building space here - a fact which Adur obviously recognises.

It also says that any development initiatives must enhance the wellbeing of the local community. We would like Adur DC to explain just how this is going to improve our situation when regular flooding will become the norm?

Will Adur reduce our council tax or fund our replacements/remedial costs for all the damage and inconvenience caused? We really would like an answer to both these questions.

#### The Christmas Event

We had flooded homes/garages and gardens for weeks all contaminated with sewage. We had loss of toilet facilities – even when things were starting to get under control, at one point you could only flush the toilet literally when the tide was out and surface and ground waters started moving eastwards again!

Many lost gas supplies, particularly on all of Christmas Day. We had tanker lorries often 4 at a time operating in our each of our 4 local streets – 24 hours a day – disruption of sleep was a severe problem for many.

For over 3 months one Manor Close resident had an over pumping unit from the road outside, with heavyweight pipes through their front and rear gardens into a ditch behind where a rear fence section was taken out. These residents suffered greatly and they had only moved into their 'dream retirement home' just two months previous to the event.

Other residents had to pump out under floor spaces to prevent rising ground water coming into their home – some were not as lucky and have had insurance claims with the remaining smell to prove it.

And when it was dry enough all these areas had to be cleansed by Southern Water. Many gardens were ruined by loss of bushes and plants which had been submerged under water for so long.

Very few members and Adur executives will have seen the long term devastation in our area caused by an inundated flood plain and A27 over the Christmas event. Below are some of the images of the flooding which our residents in North Lancing experienced for 8 weeks over Christmas into the New Year.

#### 2, A27 Objections – Map 7

Unacceptable traffic congestion, increased risk to public safety

We find it totally unbelievable that the Highways Agency is happy with yet another roundabout on the Lancing stretch of the A27 and the increased volume of vehicles from the proposed NMF and airport developments (policies 5 & 7) onto this vital trunk road which is already at over capacity,.

7 years ago the HA fought against a 100 homes development for the same area because of the traffic impact on the A27 which overturned the application at a hearing. How on earth can the additional traffic output from 600 homes and 25,000sq m of business development be even considered.

This is pure madness. The only outcome will be gridlock at all times in the day, increased accidents and even more problems for our residents finding it virtually impossible to access the road because of continual traffic flows.

And, to make it even worse, they are prepared to give approval to this roundabout option along the Lancing stretch of this dual carriageway!

We doubt the professionalism of these so called experts. Just think back to last year and the 3 months drainage works pre Christmas on the same stretch and the desperate problems caused because it did not work. They had failed to prove the drainage outfalls as part of the start up plan! They just assumed they would work! We saw the worst flooding ever experienced for this section of the A27.

This proposal would bring absolutely no benefit to Adur and particularly Lancing in terms of the regeneration of the area. It will do exactly the reverse. Companies will avoid investing in the area, people will avoid coming into the area. The A27 is one of the main stumbling blocks to the accessibility of this district – people and companies already avoid it like the plague. With the proposed changes it will create degeneration, not regeneration.

We are totally opposed to the additional roundabout proposed at either the Sussex Pad or just south west of the Withy Patch and this must be excluded from the plan. In the interests of the community and the many thousands of users who already experience the delays which this road causes.

.....

### 3. Wildlife Concerns (Policies 5&7)

In both these areas there is a high level of wild life which use these natural green space areas and drainage ditches as their habitat. Frequently, roe deer are welcomed by residents in the Old Shoreham Road as they even come into their back gardens. There are bats – one of our residents is well versed in these creatures and has batmeter readings which prove their presence across parts of the flood plain area. There are badgers, foxes, invertebrates galore, protected water voles, crested newts (also protected) lapwings (particularly around the policy 7 area), slow worms, grass snakes and innumerable species of birds.

To turn much of this area into building development will decimate the habitat for these much loved indigenous species.

Restricting their presence to a limited bio diverse area behind the Old Shoreham Road will spell the death knell for these creatures. As part of their requirement to survive, many need to move uninhibited around the total green space which currently exists, already eroded by the Albion complex. Being constricted to just the small 'bio area' mentioned with no chance to roam south or east because a building development is in the way will mean their ability to survive is at great risk.

We must protect this legacy of our natural wildlife for future generations at all costs and not decimate it because of hard nosed, unbalanced

government thinking and policies. If nature cannot be protected in its own right – and much of it can, then Adur has the arguments with drainage and infrastructure issues to prevent this damage to the wild life. They must exercise those arguments to the fullest extent.

.....

#### 4. Loss of Green space (Policies 5&7)

Along this coastline the Lancing Shoreham Gap is the only area where the South Downs run virtually down to the sea without any significant coastal urban development.

This proposed building would mean a severe loss of green space for the area both visually and physically. Adur has always managed to preserve this Gap. It's part of the character of the area as much as the airport is an excellent feature.of interest to visitors to the area.

The madness of this government drive to build on green spaces is totally unacceptable. Once again here, Adur must use the strength of the drainage and infrastructure arguments to guarantee that this green space is preserved for the community and future generations.

.....

#### 5. Brownfield Opportunities

We believe that there are far more opportunities for development on brownfield sites in Adur. What about conversion of empty shops and offices which is now possible under current planning policies.

If Adur undertook a really intensive study we believe that the number projected up to 800 homes could potentially rise to take out another 500 homes from the figures they are projecting. That could be the size of the New Monks Farm development.

30% of the Adur community are aged 60+ and this percentage is growing year on year. Older senior citizens will be looking to downsize and in many cases move into care assisted properties which many of the brownfield sites answer the need for. Smaller dwellings with an opportunity to achieve more dwellings with the space available. This would free up family homes which we are told are so much in demand.

We urge the authority to re-examine these other opportunities in the interests of protecting this community.

.....

#### 6. Other Build Opportunities

The NPPF requires neighbouring authorities to liaise and support each other when housing targets cannot be reached.

The biggest opportunity Adur has is to work with the South Downs National Park Authority to agree to permit building on some obvious sites to the north of the A27.

One immediately springs to mind which is not flood plain bound and whilst there would be an impact on the A27, would provide the opportunity for at least another 4-500 dwellings. This is on the north west quadrant of the A27 intersection at Busticle Lane. This is currently farmland. Any development would still leave a lot of countryside between it and the north part of Sompting to the west without impingeing on the sanity of that village.

The other is the cement works. The South Downs Authority and Horsham should be urged to allow development there to assist Adur with its

housing numbers.

We urge Adur to vigorously pursue these with the SDNPA and Horsham.

Lidl are canvassing support for a store in Brighton Road Shoreham. The site is at least an acre – ideal for Adur to start rebuilding its council owned housing stock on a brownfield site. We need more supermarkets like ‘a hole in the head’ – but we do need more houses.

Also, if the Mayfield development being discussed to the west of the A23 does come to fruition, is this not the salvation we have been looking for?

We feel these opportunities must be pursued vigorously to endeavour to reduce the levels of build in this highly space restricted district.

.....

In summary, Lancing Manor SE Residents’ Network is asking the elected councillors of Adur District Council to have the courage to take the right action to protect the wellbeing of all its residents – there must be no further building development on the Lancing Shoreham Gap. Adur must have the will to defend that vigorously and conclusively to take care of its rate paying community.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Strategic Allocations

The County Council is supportive of the approach to provision of education infrastructure for the strategic sites outlined in the revised draft Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). A site for a 1form of entry (fe) school with the possibility to expand to 2fe is required. This is based on a consideration of the strategic sites and allocation for smaller developments within the built up area of Adur. This new primary school would be most suitably located at the New Monks Farm site, therefore land for a new primary school site will be required as part of the New Monks Farm development for both the lower and upper levels of development proposed. The schools in Lancing are all quite full and the majority are already at three forms of entry (fe). If the County Council was to continue expanding the schools, this would not comply with County policy of no more than 3fe. As outlined in the draft IDP, a further primary school site may be required as part of the Shoreham Harbour strategic allocation. This will depend on the capacity available to expand existing schools in the local area.

Revised draft policies 5, 6, & 7: Where the policies refer to 'assessments' and 'an assessment of archaeological assets (sampled by field evaluation)...' etc. Please refer to NPPF paragraph 128 which states that LPAs 'should require developers to submit a desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.' Desk based assessment (DBA), based on information obtained from the HER is a sensible starting point for major schemes and is worth including in the wording of the policy. A field evaluation (essentially a trial trenching exercise) is the most cost effective way to manage risk by quantifying whether mitigation measures will be required for proposal sites with unknown archaeological potential and establishing what level of resource will be needed. DBA and field evaluation for major schemes should be considered at the pre-application stage, not just the planning application stage to allow the results of the assessment and evaluation to be considered in good time at the determination stage.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 34

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The floodplain is a natural phenomena designed to store excessive water from precipitation and groundwater. The proposed builds at the Airport and New Monks Farm and the current development including the thousands of tonnes of aggregate on the alleged golf course reduces the capacity of the flood plain by a third.

The development is within flood zone 3. The consequences will be devastating floods for houses within and surrounding the flood plain. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH NO MORE DEVELOPMENT ON THE FLOOD PLAIN. COMMON SENSE MUST PREVAIL.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The Sussex Wildlife Trust has concerns that the policy already recognises the need for ecological mitigation if this area is developed. We are disappointed that given the polices early recognition of this fact, prior to any formal application the measures for mitigation are not given more consideration. We feel the policy needs to express that development will only be permitted if the mitigation is suitable. The policy should also go further in its wording to say 'ecological enhancements will be sought through all aspects of development on this site, for example green roofs etc to take into account visual sensitivities of the landscape and offer biodiversity opportunities'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 987

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Natural England

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It is welcomed that further evidence is being gathered around the potential landscape and biodiversity impacts of the new access and roundabouts which would be needed for the New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport developments to go ahead.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Shoreham Airport

As the future commercial development of the airfield relies on improved access from the A27, the design and layout will need to take into account the World War II dome trainer which is a scheduled ancient monument (and its setting). As the dome trainer is on the north side of the airfield, it is inevitable that the improved access works will be close by. It is difficult to comment on the specific implications at this stage, but the need for setting issues to be considered must be noted.

This proposal gives strong support to delivery of the Shoreham Tidal Walls project, particularly the increase in status of the current public footpath to public bridleway along the western bank of the River Adur. It also lends itself to supporting up-grade in status and improvement of the current public footpath running north from Old Shoreham Tollbridge on the western bank of the river to Cuckoo Corner – this would be an attractive and safe way for cyclists, perhaps also horses, to enter the South Downs National Park.

Draft Policy 7: Please remove 'residential' from the Travel Plan description.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Comments as above, there are bridleways directly north of the A27, to which all non-motorised users (NMUs) should have safe access. WSLAF has been in discussion with the Highways Agency regarding NMU crossings of the A27 and would be happy to share our knowledge and expertise with Adur DC Officers.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 957

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

600 homes and 25,000sq m of business development in the Lancing Shoreham flood plain??!! A roundabout on the A27??!!

Just what planet is this authority living on? Angry? I am more than angry at the total negligence being exercised by this council not to ensure the continued well being of its residents, something which is clearly stipulated in the National Planning Policy Framework. According to this policy the community should in fact be enjoying improving benefit from such initiatives within the area not the absolute reverse.

How many of the officers and councillors experienced what the residents here in North Lancing experienced last Christmas into the New Year?

None, I would suggest!

Otherwise they would not even dare to put to the public such an outrageous proposal which even an idiot can see will end in disaster for not only the current community but any family or person who invests in these proposed new builds – if they are lucky enough to get flood cover or a mortgage.

For mobility I have to always use a wheel chair. When the event struck last Christmas, we could not even use our toilet facilities. One flush and it overflowed into our homes. My being incapacitated, this was an absolute nightmare for a long period until some respite came in small bursts to allow the toilet to be flushed when the tide was out at Shoreham!.

Apart from that my back garden was awash with water for weeks into February and totally unusable. We had tankers pumping for weeks in our local roads, four at a time in our small close. Sleeping at nights became virtually impossible.

It was absolutely hell!!!

And this council is prepared to let this occur frequently by filling the flood plain with concrete because the Environment Agency says flood risk can be mitigated for. What world are they living in? Did this agency do a study after the recent flooding? I know they didn't – their data is based upon readings taken in a dry spell in 2012 – absolutely irrelevant to what followed.

The Highways Agency are no better. They reject an application at the end of Manor Close some 7 years ago – the same site as the planned development because of resulting traffic flows being unacceptable to the operation of the A27 – and now they are happy for the enormous increase in traffic volumes from the flood plain developments and with a roundabout to boot!

Apart from the total inability of this over capacity road to cope – it will make it highly dangerous and virtually impossible for local residents including myself to access this trunk road because of continuous flowing traffic because of the roundabout.

To conclude, as a long term resident in Lancing, I insist, as do my fellow neighbours, – more relevantly – demand that the planned development policies 5 & 7 are take out of the Adur Plan and the experiences of the community in Lancing be used to demonstrate to the government inspectors that this flood plain area is unsustainable and puts the total well being of our Lancing community at risk.

As elected members to represent us, the district councillors must take notice of the rate paying public that voted for them and make the right decision.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 974

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Brighton & Hove City Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

At the previous stage of consultation, BHCC as joint freeholder drew the District Council's attention to a covenant in the lease which required any development of the site not to jeopardise the runway use and airport operations. The City Council seeks assurance that the revised allocation meets the requirements of the covenant.

---

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

## OBJECTIONS TO THE REVISED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN

## 2.01

Specific objections in relation to the strategic site allocation of 15,000sq m of employment space on the airfield at Shoreham Airport:

A) The airfield lies within the Local Green Gap between Lancing and Shoreham and west of the River Adur. Future development of this site on the scale proposed would have an adverse impact on the purpose of the gap, which is to maintain openness and avoid coalescence of the settlements of Shoreham and Lancing, as set out in Revised Draft Policies 2 & 13. The Revised DLP sets out to protect the open areas between settlements, as part of its Vision and Objectives (O7), but contradicts itself by its proposal to allocate this site, which would narrow the gap significantly. The Urban Fringe Study 2006 (UFS) concluded that 'Area 3 (Shoreham Airport) makes a significant contribution to the openness of the strategic gap. Despite the built up nature of the airport and nearby employment uses, there is little scope for further development outside of these current developed areas without prejudicing the wider open nature of the gap' (Ch 6.28 p.53).

B) 80% of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b defined as 'functional flood plain' and at a higher risk of flooding than the Steyning Road site. (See Appendix E – Lancing Gap Tidal Flood Map) The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 100, states that this type of land should be safeguarded from development where it is required for current and future flood management (also Revised Draft Policy 13).

C) Future use of the airfield land for development is dependent on the £15m Adur Tidal Wall Scheme (TWS) raising the existing flood risk from Category 3b to 3a before it can be properly considered. The Steyning Road site to the east of the river is already categorized within Flood Zone 3a. Therefore, under the sequential test, NPPF paragraph 100, the proposed land allocation within the airfield should be discounted by more suitable sites such as the Steyning Road site, which is already at a lower risk of flooding. However, the Revised DLP supports the implementation of a TWS that will increase the flood risk to the Steyning Road site rather than secure and enhance its long term viability for uses that would benefit the District. (See Appendix F – Environment Agency Letter, confirming that their preferred strategy could be influenced.)

D) The latest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) final report states under paragraph 4.3.3 'recent modelling to test the effect of building the west bank Adur Tidal Walls showed that, if the walls were built along the west bank, the depth of flooding, hence risk, increases on the east bank. This information suggests that the west bank area of the Adur (including Shoreham Airport) provides a degree of storage at present and should, based on the evidence available, [still] be considered functional [flood plain]'. This is contrary to the criteria that must be met by an Exemption test, where a flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible will reduce flood risk overall. It is further contrary to NPPF (paragraph 100) 'safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management'. The EA's current preferred option for the northern reach of their scheme will result in increasing the risk of flooding to the Steyning Road site (currently at a lower risk category than the Shoreham airfield) and the surrounding area of the A27/A283 interchange.

E) The Employment Land Review 2011 (ELR) site assessment rated the Shoreham Airport site inadequate for internal road access and poor for public transport provision under accessibility and poor for access to amenity. Funding for a major road infrastructure upgrade with a new roundabout at the Sussex Pad and a link road through the airfield to the site will be needed to rectify this. It would depend upon;

i) funding to facilitate these infrastructure improvements that will not be generated from piecemeal development where wholesale development is very unlikely and delivery at all is a major risk;

ii) to access onto the A27 where vehicle traffic movements already exceeds capacity. This will be the case even if the site provides local employment because of poor pedestrian and public transport links to the airfield.

F) The impact of noise from aircraft movements would need to be taken into consideration. Furthermore, the noise impact from traffic movements on the A27 is more significant to this site than to the Steyning Road site because of its topographical relationship. Where the A27 is elevated, it has less impact on the immediate ground level areas.

G) The Land is subject to a section 106 agreement which restricts development for further employment uses.

H) Development would negatively impact on the airport as an historic airfield visitor attraction and its contribution to the visual distinctiveness of the Lancing Local Gap which offers open and distant views connection the settings of its Grade II\* listed terminal building and Grade II listed hangar with the Scheduled Ancient Monuments along the river bank, the wooden Grade II\* listed Old Shoreham Bridge river crossing, the Grade I Shoreham Town Parish Church of St Nicholas and the Grade I listed Lancing College Chapel. Any development within the airfield will demonstrably harm the setting of these structures and the visual relationship between them. In contrast, development of the Steyning Road site, as a small extension of the urban fringe, will have no significant impact on the setting of these heritage assets because the site is contained and separated from them by existing buildings and significant physical landscape features.

I) Site is subject to detailed work regarding landscaping and biodiversity value for the area in order to positively influence the design capacity of the site. (See Revised Draft Policy 7, which requires the undertaking of Ecological Studies at the planning stage in order to protect the adjacent SSSI.)

J) Allocation of this site is inconsistent with the Revised DLP's vision and objectives (V7/O7) to protect the setting and landscape of the South Downs National Park (SDNP), river Adur and the local green gaps. The Landscape & Ecology Study (LES) describes the open green landscape of the airport as being 'the focus of longer high sensitivity views from the SDNP' and that the area 'has exceptionally high visual sensitivity'. The report goes on to conclude that mitigation of the visual impact of any development at this location would be very difficult.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We agree that the Airport plays a key part in the commercial, cultural and historic character of Shoreham.

- We note with concern the increasing deterioration of the Grade 2\* listed terminal building (identified as a 'heritage asset'). The terminal building should not be lost through neglect or used as a pawn in some kind of planning game by the current airport operators. The local authority through its Enforcement Officer must exert its powers to ensure this does not happen.

- We support employment-generating floor space in the north east corner of the airport but we consider that improvement to the A27 Sussex Pad junction (in Appendix RD10) does not go far enough. Members are puzzled by "the package of site specific travel behaviour initiatives". What are they? It has been suggested that an improved road from the Sussex Pad to the Saltings roundabout, going under the Railway Bridge alongside the river, provides

o Good access for trading

o Allows for a through public bus service

o Reduces traffic on the Upper Shoreham Road A283 and the High Street (Ropetackle) roundabout.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 987

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Natural England

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

It is welcomed that Biodiversity benefits have been included within the Green Infrastructure section notably paragraphs 4.90 and 4.93.

- The development of the Shoreham Airport site would result in possible negative impacts however it is good to see that under policy 2.95 there is provision for protecting and where possible enhancing the adjoining Adur Estuary SSSI.
  - It is also good to see that landscape issues and opportunities will be considered when looking at the allocations of employment land at the airport, and that green infrastructure would be required on site to help mitigate for possible loss of Greenfield sites as a result of the development.
  - When looking at habitat creation and monitoring of this consideration should be given to (as previously mentioned) Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats, effective management and appropriate monitoring.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 973

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sustrans

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### KEY ISSUE 7 (p13)

The need to address road congestion and related pollution – air and noise – whilst improving the existing transport network.

The Active Travel Strategy from the Department of Health and Department for Transport (February 2010) argued that putting walking and cycling at the heart of local transport and public health strategies will improve public health, tackle congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve the local environment.

The vision, objectives, and policies do not place sustainable transport at the heart of the Adur Local Plan. The overall impression is that sustainable transport is regarded as a mitigation measure to manage increasing levels of congestion and air pollution. Long-term, strategic investment in sustainable modes of transport has the potential to deliver against a far greater range the ALP's objectives. Moreover, using the Government's own methods of assessing the economic benefits of transport schemes, Sustrans has shown that local walking and cycling schemes have a benefit to cost ratio of 20:1. In times of severe budget restrictions this sits in stark contrast to the typical ratio of just 3:1 for other transport schemes such as rail and roads.

The comments that follow illustrate these points.

Waves Ahead – The Sustainable Community Strategy (1.38: p14)

Investment in measures that would make walking and cycling an attractive travel choice would contribute to all the objectives of the 'Waves Ahead' sustainable community strategy:

The health and well-being of active travel;

The social inclusion that comes with making walking and cycling a safe and affordable travel choice for people of all ages and abilities;

The economic benefits of reducing congestion;

The environmental benefits that would help to make Adur a better place to live.

Active, sustainable transport needs to be at the heart of the Adur Local Plan if this potential is to be realised. A clear strategic vision is critically important and Sustrans would like to see this recognised in the vision and objectives of the ALP.

In the current environment funding comes from a variety of sources and decision making is devolved to a number of different bodies. Without strategic direction and commitment, there is a high risk that spending on sustainable transport is piecemeal; schemes are not planned in a joined-up way; and value-for-money is not achieved and benefits to the community are not realised.

Travel Behaviour Change Programmes (Appendix RD10)

Travel behaviour change (TBC) programmes (p217) could be run across the whole of Adur to meet an objective of modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. It is not clear what evidence supports the statement that travel behaviour change programmes "have the greatest impact... within and around the development sites" (p217). Placed in this Appendix, it would appear that TBC programmes are viewed purely as a mitigation measure to help manage increasing levels of congestion. This sells short the potential benefits and value for money that might be achieved. Significant benefits against a wider range of objectives might be achieved by running TBC programmes within existing urban areas across Adur.

Junction Improvements (Appendix RD10)

"Highway mitigation schemes are required for nine of thirteen key junctions" (p217). By managing congestion at these points, road transport becomes a more attractive option. No evidence is presented to show that the congestion (and associated problems such as air pollution) is not shifted to other points on the road network. Sustrans would like to see:

A cost-benefit analysis comparing the value of these highway mitigation schemes against investment in sustainable modes of transport.

An assessment of ALP objectives that are met by the highway mitigation schemes compared to investment in sustainable modes of transport.

The observation is made that in West Sussex a number of highway mitigation schemes, while managing greater volumes of traffic, have been detrimental to cycling.

#### Strategic Cycle Routes

While specific junctions have been identified for mitigation measures (Appendix RD10) and 'proposed roundabout options' drawn up (Map 7, p54), measures to improve sustainable modes of transport are mostly generalised statements of intent with caveats such as "where feasible".

Sustrans would like to see included in the Adur Local Plan a commitment to develop high quality cycle routes in two key areas to improve access into and out of Shoreham. This would be consistent with other policies in the Adur Local Plan: Revised Draft Policy 13 (p92): "Improvements to green infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle links, will be supported". Revised Draft Policy 26: The Visitor Economy (p121). "Access (including new footpaths, cycleways and slipways) to the river, the coast and the South Downs National Park should be improved where possible". Shoreham Harbour Regeneration (p63): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path that links the new Adur Ferry Bridge with Southwick Locks, suitable for both leisure and utility cyclists. This would become the new alignment of National Cycle Network Route 2, rather than the existing inland route.

Shoreham Airport (p51): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path between North Lancing and the Adur Tollbridge. An improved cycle and walking crossing of the A27 to link the Old Shoreham Road and Coombes Road to provide access to Lancing College, the South Downs National Park and Steyning. A signed cycle route through the Airport linking the Downslink Path at the Adur Tollbridge to National Cycle Network Route 2 east of Widewater Lagoon.

The proposed roundabout changes at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm (p54) should be designed with high-quality cycle routes as part of the brief. The designs presented in Map 7 (p54) would appear to be designed to manage increased traffic levels. Designs that also make cycling a more attractive travel choice would also help to manage the levels of traffic.

#### Cycling in Urban Areas

Sustrans would like to see a policy commitment in the Adur Local Plan to make urban areas more attractive to cycling so that a bike ride is a safe, quick and affordable travel choice for trips to local amenities. This might include:

Designating or upgrading suitable footpaths as shared-use space, such as the existing link between Nicolson Drive and Middle Road in Shoreham.

Introducing cycling contraflows on one-way streets, such as in East Street, Shoreham.

Reducing speed limits on all residential roads to 20mph.

In the same way that specific road junctions have been identified, mitigation measures could be identified to remove barriers to access on foot or by bike to important destinations, such as schools, health centres, railway stations, and shops.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 965

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Everything we have learned about the Adur Plan is pure madness. The points below are just some of the issues which building on the Lancing Shoreham Gap will cause, let alone unbelievably an additional roundabout which is being proposed for the A27.

1. Flood Plain, what part do they not understand. Remember Last Christmas?
2. Sea levels are meant to be getting higher.
3. Water, not long ago we were going to have Drought?
4. Electricity, talking about not enough back up.
5. Who is going to live there, are we going to create villages to bite us back in years to come (& pay for them to be there).
6. A27 comes to grinding halt due to so much added local traffic and the pollution that goes with it.
7. The Airport has been there for years, all the people in the 600 homes will complain about the noise and want it closed down (then build some more houses)!
8. Have insurance companies been invited to see if they would actually insure these properties (especially if they might be under water).
9. And what about the wild life? Already a large area has been lost to the football club development.
10. And flash floods? Heavy rain is more frequent. Will the area be able to cope, when it's not coping now?

As our elected members, Adur District councillors must delete the New Monks Farm and Airport and A27 developments from the plan for the wellbeing of the local community. Not to do so will create degeneration for the residents of Lancing not regeneration!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 956

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham District Ornithological Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Development site 3

'Employment generating floorspace' in the north east corner of the airport.

I object to any further buildings being constructed along the eastern side of the airfield.

The historic existence of the Ricardos site should not be taken as a precedent for further development southwards. Ricardos development commenced before planning laws were introduced. In these more ecologically enlightened times I doubt if that site would be granted planning permission. There would almost certainly be strong local objection to its erection within the green gap, much as we now value Ricardos presence in the town.

If commercial floorspace is needed it should not be adjacent to the west side of the river where it would be built on land adjacent to and intrinsically linked to the Adur Estuary SSSI. If space cannot be found within the airport to support their commercial needs then commercial space should have been retained in accordance with the 'Shoreham Renaissance Plan' of a few years ago when Ropetackle North was earmarked. At that time it was a commercial site until the owner refused to renew leases of successfully trading enterprises in order to make big bucks selling to housing developers!

At this time in wildlife circles the emphasis is on landscape scale conservation and wildlife corridors. Building etc as proposed, if the river is included in the green gap, would be taking a bite out of the middle of the green landscape and partially blocking the wildlife corridor. Allowing the proposed development would then set a precedent for more in a progression south in the future until the original plans aims are achieved thereby completely cutting off the river from the remainder of the green gap. Nibble at the edges for additional housing on the west side of the airport if you can't resist that but please do not divide up the remaining gap into separate sections and divorce the river from the green areas. The current proposal would start that division.

The intrinsic relationship with the river SSSI is that precisely the area proposed for construction is the winter foraging and high tide roosting area for several hundred wading birds, mainly lapwings which are already listed as a bird of conservation concern due to the loss of habitat. The council's proposal is nothing short of further loss of habitat. This area is very close to the river and is the least disturbed by aeronautical and human activity. Should any planning applications be submitted the Ornithological community would call upon wildlife organisations and Natural England for support in objecting.

Also the buildings would spoil the amenity value of the riverside walks with their green largely unobstructed view towards the downs. The river walks would become hemmed in by buildings and therefore prohibiting psychologically beneficial relaxing escape from the built environment.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 53

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We write to strenuously object to the development proposals in the Lancing - Shoreham flood plain at New Monks Farm and the airport.

After the devastation of the last Christmas event which this area in North Lancing suffered, we cannot believe that Adur District Council can even think to propose their developments.

Do they not realise just how much we suffered for an 8 week period into the New Year because of the inability of this shallow plain to cope with the prolonged wet weather experienced during that period.

It was the worst experience of this sort of problem even seen for the 40 years we have lived here.

We had flood water up to within an inch of entering our bungalow. The front and rear gardens were 6" of water for many those weeks. We have two small dogs who could not be let out without carrying them out to higher dryer ground for fear that they may even drown!

We had tankers operating for 24 hours a day for nearly the 8 week period which made sleeping almost an impossibility - not to talk about loss of toilet facilities because of inundated sewers!

With all this, the council is still prepared to risk our well being by allowing such development. This is madness, bordering on neglect of the community it serves!

As for proposed roundabout on the A27 which, despite remedial drainage works running up to Christmas, after which this stretch of roads saw the worst flooding ever - this is absolutely nonsensical.

Residents like ourselves who rely upon the occasional break in the traffic caused by the Sussex Pad traffic lights will find it impossible to access the A27. A roundabout to the east of us will create a continual flow of traffic, particularly with the enormous increase of vehicles entering from the New Monks Farm and airport developments. This will cause a highly dangerous situation for all who live here along this over busy stretch which already has a high incidence of accidents.

How can Highways Agency be happy to allow this when they turned down a few years ago a proposed development on the same land because of the inability for the A27 to cope with the increased traffic from 100 homes - now it's 600 homes plus large business development areas!

We insist that the development areas, policies 5 & 7 be struck from the Adur Plan and that authority must strongly defend this decision to the government based upon maintaining the well being of all the residents who live around this sensitive flood plain.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 49

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The RSPB

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The RSPB welcomes the changes that have been made to Policy 7 Shoreham Airport to reduce the size of the proposed development at Shoreham Airport and to ensure that the development does not impact on either the adjacent Adur estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or the ecological value of the airport itself in terms of its role supporting wintering/wading birds. We also welcome the recommendations to seek opportunities for ecological enhancements and to draw up a site wide landscape and ecological management plan. The RSPB accordingly removes its objection detailed in our previous response of 31 October 2013.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 975

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation New Monks Farm Development Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Enplan UK Ltd

SEE EMAILS FOR ATTACHMENTS

We object to any references within this policy to new access arrangements onto the A27 from the airport in order to serve the proposed development of the site as insufficient supporting evidence has been provided to the Highways Agency and the scheme has not been progressed to demonstrate that it is a deliverable or effective safe solution. This is in contrast to the westerly proposal positioned on land at New Monks Farm, which is well advanced with the Highways Agency and deliverable from both a land ownership and technical perspective We object to the roundabout option 1 Shoreham airport as shown as part of Map 7.

References to Shoreham Airport proposed access to A27 within Revised Draft Local Plan We object to all references to the proposed new access onto the A27 to serve the Shoreham Airport development. We do not consider this is a deliverable option. We therefore object/comment on the following:

1. Para 2.53 is supported only if the reference is made to the new access onto the A27 from NMF and not the airport
2. We object to any reference in para 2.57 to an improved/new access to the airport and support the new roundabout at NMF.
3. We object to any reference in para 2.87 to an improved/new access to the airport and support the new roundabout at NMF.
4. We are concerned with the contents of para 2.88. It seeks to highlight the need for the roundabout onto the A27 being located at NMF due to the delays in bringing forward the airport development option.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 713

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We cannot cope on the A27 with the volume of traffic already, especially at peak times in the summer when it can be gridlocked. These plans would only mean more traffic on the roads.

This is a flood land. I personally have seen this land badly flooded at least a few times over the years.

We don't need anymore 'affordable homes'. We have very good bungalows and semi's, and as people die off (we have a lot of elderly people), young people can buy them at a premium and rennovate.

We need to invest and support businesses which are struggling in Lancing, along with the Churchill Estate - not create other businesses.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 511

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 945

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having experienced severe drainage problems from Summer 2012 through to the early part of 2013 we are strongly objecting to the development proposals in the Adur Draft Plan for the New Monks Farm and Airport areas (Policies 5 & 7).

Building up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5) with a school, community centre, 10,000 sq metres of business development plus all the road infrastructure will create an absolutely unacceptable flood risk for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern perimeters of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain..

The same applies to the 15,000 sq metres of proposed business development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

We experienced 8 weeks of devastation last Christmas with serious flooding, loss of sewerage and gas and know instinctively that the agencies and developers simply cannot mitigate this flood risk in such a shallow fall flood plain – 4 feet fall across 2 miles to the Shoreham sluices. It's a planning policy built on lunacy.

The draft plan has absolutely neglected to take account of this Christmas flooding event which has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds of the ratepayers' money to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation will be impossible in periods of sustained wet weather. How much more proof is required?

There are many similar examples nationally where so called mitigation has been actioned by the Environment Agency and developers with disastrous outcomes for home owners with no recourse for damage – Recar on Teeside and St Asaph in Denbighshire are just two such examples.

If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area, whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters.

Even though on the south side, for 'technical reasons', Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan, any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park. All areas in Lancing are interconnected by one thing – a flood plain.

The same 'technical reasons' must apply to New Monks Farm and the airport developments and they must be taken out of the plan

Whatever the so called experts say, we have absolutely no confidence in their judgement that flood risk in this area can be mitigated for.

Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas and into the New Year and defend their action to Government to exclude this flood plain development from the plan.

In terms of infrastructure, it is completely unacceptable to even contemplate a roundabout (Map7) on this stretch of the A27. The road is at over capacity now.

Seven years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected by the Highways Agency. This was the main reason a hearing upheld the decision to not approve the application.

If the A27 then was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes, how can it approve the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed. Together with the proposed roundabout, this is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council, its councillors and officers have no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its rate paying community.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 508

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am one of the people that suffered with flooding last Christmas also many times in the past, also having sewer problems. The extra volume of traffic is a cause for concern.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 528

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

SEE EMAIL ALSO.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to OBJECT to the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 and (Plan) Map 6 of the Draft Adur District Plan. I write as a local resident.

CURRENT SITUATION.

Because the Airport is a large open area between the Adur and Lancing, the public paths and embankments along the river enjoy a pleasant outlook to the West. This is appreciated by visitors and residents. I personally take great pleasure in walking beside the river and over the Toll Bridge and these are the areas that I treat as my local park.

Walks beside the river are used by large numbers of people. The area is one of the most accessible, attractive public spaces in the vicinity.

The views can be appreciated by users of the A283 in both directions and westwards on the Upper Shoreham Road. Pub goers sit out at the front of the Amsterdam and Red Lion, which are venues for visitors, especially from the adjacent Downsway Trail.

The views and the walks are a characteristic feature of the Old Shoreham Conservation Area which extends both sides of the Upper Shoreham Road and includes the Eastern riverside and the approach to the Toll Bridge.

I particularly enjoy bird watching beside the river and the many overwintering birds are a special attraction. Some, notably Lapwings, use the grass areas of the airport as winter feeding grounds.

There is a great contrast between the open outlook over the Airport and the busy industrial area developed by Ricardo P.L.C to the north of the Toll Bridge.

It is a fact that the freehold of the Airport is still owned by Worthing and Brighton/Hove Councils. These authorities could therefore have a financial interest in the outcome of the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7.

Of course, Adur Council is independent of the two freeholders. However, the Planning Department of Adur has moved to Worthing and the two councils have merged to the extent that, for some time, they have shared a Chief Executive and other functions. Their identity is 'Worthing and Adur Councils'.

I know that the Toll Bridge is Listed Grade II and its setting is therefore sensitive. It is also important that the area east of the river is the Old Shoreham Conservation area, as mentioned. This includes the land up to the eastern footing of the Toll Bridge and the embankment, as far as the

river shore, as well as housing and the medieval Church of St Nicolas.

The South Downs National Park is immediately to the north of the A27 and there are views from it over the airport. I also visit places in the Park, such as Mill Hill and Lancing Clump, from times to time and know that these views would be made less attractive if the major business allocations shown in Policy 7 was implemented.

#### ILLUSTRATIONS.

Several photographs are included to show various views towards the site affected by the major business allocation proposed in policy 7. The positions are marked on Map 2 (attached as e-mail PDF only).

Photos 1-3 are a sequence along the Upper Shoreham Road from the junction with St Nicolas Lane (1) to Connaught Avenue (2) and the riverside (3). Locations 2-5 are in the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. They show the view west over the Airport. Appendix 1 shows how the alignment of the Upper Shoreham Road leads towards the major business allocation proposed in policy 7 site.

Photos 4 and 5 are taken from the approach to the Toll Bridge from the east. They are both from the western end of the Conservation Area which is where the listed Bridge begins.

Photo 4 looks southwest from the southern side of the Bridge over the airport towards the major business allocation proposed in policy 7.

Photo 5, from north side of the Bridge and due north of the point used for photo 4, looks northwest towards Ricardo's.

These photographs demonstrate what I am concerned could happen to the views west over the airport, south of the Bridge, if business development happens. The example of Ricardo's shows how the western side of the river, south of the Toll Bridge, could look from the east.

#### CONCLUSION.

I am asking for the major business allocation proposed in policy 7 to be removed from the Draft Plan and the land sought to be found elsewhere in the District. That should be discussed separately but it is clear that there are other possibilities.

The Policy as it stands raises many questions including:

a) What would the actual impact on views over the site be? I have put forward my concerns and it is noticeable that there are no professional visualisations of the impacts, only verbal assurances to 'minimise' impacts, not that they will be acceptable.

B) How would the (S52) agreement need to be altered to allow the site to be released and what are the implications of that?

C) Who stands to benefit from the release and are there valid grounds for 'enabling development' here?

D) What are the realistic alternatives to releasing this site and what would their impacts be in comparison?

E) What is the most appropriate new junction design on the A27 and where would it be?

F) Is the flood prevention scheme practical, and funded and when might it happen?

Most significantly, the major business allocation proposed in policy 7 would bring about major damage to the local public amenities, including the settings of the Toll Bridge and land in the Old Shoreham Conservation Area, important designated Heritage Assets.

I therefore ask you to remove the major business allocation proposed in policy 7 from the next version of the Local Plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

This residents' network wishes to raise the following points and requests that if the policies 5 & 7 remain in the Adur Plan, they wish to be present at the hearing by the government inspector to discuss these points together with those covered in our email of the 8th November 2013.

The residents concerns for future wellbeing are considerable, with particularly both the exclusion or the inclusion of the NMF development. If the NMF proposals are excluded from the plan, will the same developer complete the golf course or leave the public purse to pick up the pieces in terms of restoring the land to its original natural status and for the maintenance of the ditch network which is so crucial to the well being of the area? Whatever the outcome is, this together with the proposal for the airport will be a serious risk to drainage for the whole flood plain area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 856

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

### Objections for the proposed developments

My objections for the proposed developments of the Lancing, Sompting area are based on the quality of life for the present and future residents of any new developments.

Today the traffic congestion, in and around the area, is some of the worst in the country. Travelling to and from work, on any day when there isn't an accident or road works, is bad enough without the additional traffic and saturation of a possible thousand new vehicles in and around the development of Lancing and Sompting.

At present, the whole of the south coast is just one large, over-developed conurbation, with very little natural green spaces between; building on the few green spaces left should be prohibited.

It is realised by most people that there is a need for more "affordable housing" however more consideration to the location of such proposed developments should be given greater consideration. Using brown sites instead of taking more green sites away should be the priority.

As a volunteer ambulance car driver, I am very aware just how over stretched the NHS has become. I take patients from the whole of West Sussex to Brighton or Haywards Heath for their treatments because Worthing, Shoreham or Chichester NHS Trust cannot provide for them, which is distressing enough, without adding to the problems of additional traffic.

A dialysis patient typically needs a four hour session three times a week. If you live West of Worthing and travel three times a week to Brighton, and it takes hours to be transported to and from the hospital, it becomes a wretched form of existence. Please don't make it any worse!

It's a similar case for cancer patients, who must travel to Brighton for radio-therapy because Worthing and other hospitals, which are part of the same trust, are unable to provide appropriate treatment. The frustration and stress already endured by these unfortunate people will be exasperated with further congestion.

As a final and salient point, the council must have noticed that there are only west or east traffic main highways into and out of Worthing, Sompting and Lancing areas. The absence of north or south roads makes the area a geographical bottle neck of traffic, which at specific times of the day, consistently throughout the year, maintains a state of grid lock for the whole area.

How might anything up to one thousand extra cars propose to alleviate this problem or enhance the quality of life for the present or future residents of your voters?

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 699

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As a supporter of Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network, I would like to raise my concerns about the proposed major development on New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport.

As a resident living on the north side of the proposed development site, I have experienced the consequences of prolonged wet weather causing gas and sewer problems. If this plan is given the go ahead, where is all the excess water going to go? The wetland is there for a purpose, to retain the flood water during periods of heavy rain. The consequences will be disasterous if part of the flood plain is covered in concrete to build homes, a school, a community centre and 10,000 square metres of business development.

The A27 cannot cope now. The extra traffic that the development will generate would create absolute gridlock. Six years ago the Highways Agency objected to a proposal to build 100 homes on the land at the end of Manor Close because of increased traffic onto the A27. Surely they would be against the new development of up to 600 homes for the same reason.

Please consider the points raised in this letter when making a decision about this inappropriate proposed development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 854

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 853

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 708

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Map 3 - Huge loss of green gap.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 848

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 847

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Old Shoreham Road Surgery

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear ADC,

I wish to voice my strong objections to the proposed developments within the Lancing Gap [policies 5 and 7] as suggested in the Adur Draft Plan.

I write as a person who has lived and worked in the same premises in Lancing for over 50 years. I have seen the recent flooding episodes in this locality but can also recall much worse flooding in the early 60s when much more of the ground was under water for longer periods of time.

Speaking as a GP[my own business] the possibility of increased population around the surgery is attractive for increasing our trade[income] BUT common sense says building further on a flood plain is a complete "no-brainer" and should not go ahead. Various development proposals for the area of land at the end of Manor Close have been refused in the past on the grounds of poor drainage and the likelihood of increased flooding coupled with the difficulty of access onto the A27. The present proposal by dint of size is much more likely to cause significant flooding problems to existing residential areas as well as to the new build areas. A flood plain is just that.....an area that is prone to flood. I do not think we do any service to those wanting housing to give it to them in an area where it is very likely to become flooded. And it certainly does not help those in existing houses dependent on the efficient drainage across the flood plain as it will add to the "water load" on the plain making a precarious situation worse and flooding more likely. Coupled with the distress and disruption flooding causes to individual residents is the cost [to the local taxpayer] of dealing with the effects. This must be added to the equation too.

Leaving aside the flooding issue, access onto, and traffic flow along, the A27 is already very difficult at peak hours and this can only be made significantly worse if there are several hundred more dwellings, and a significant amount of businesses, to feed into it. I think this will be much worse if a school is involved too. [It is very noticeable how much easier it is getting into work along the local feeder roads when the schools are on holiday] As a health professional, I have great worries as to the long term effect on the wellbeing of residents of the increased emissions of, even more, near stationary traffic. There is also the very real risk of increased accidents where local traffic is trying to join the through traffic.

For all these reasons the proposal to build in the gap on the flood plain must be firmly resisted. Whilst I appreciate the pressures on local authorities from central government to fulfil their quotas of new build housing, nobody is helped by palpably wrong decisions. The Gap is not the place for more development and ADC must reject these proposals and look at less damaging ones, defending their decisions firmly to central government if needed.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes references in the draft Policy 7 to:

- (i) New development minimising its impact on the open nature of the green gap and ensuring that key views are retained,
- (ii) Access across the A27 to the South Downs National Park for pedestrians and cyclists must be retained, and
- (iii) the requirement for a site wide landscape and ecological management plan.

However, SDNPA has concerns about the landscape impact of new development of the scale being proposed in this area could have on the setting of the National Park and views from key vantage points from the National Park and would wish to be closely involved in discussions with the district council and the developers to ensure that any impact is minimised and mitigated against.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 844

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

Dear Sir or Madam,

1. I wish to OBJECT to the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 and (Plan) Map 6 of the Draft Adur District Plan. I write as a local resident.
2. The Plan includes a proposed business allocation of 15,000m2 on Shoreham Airport1. A number of points about the proposal stand out.
3. Policy 7 itself says (para 2.86) there is "potential to provide approximately 15,000 m2 employment generating floorspace in the NE corner of the airport without significant impacts on the open character of the area between Shoreham and Lancing and key views to and from the South Downs as well as Airport operations..."
4. Policy 7 also says that the development "...must be designed to minimise its impact on the open nature of the Shoreham-Lancing Local Green Gap and ensure key views are retained as well as minimise any impacts on the historic character of the Airport and historic assets within it".
5. The proposal is also presented as 'enabling development ' (see Para 2.84), intended to secure the viability of the airport itself. Thus the paragraph says
  - a. "The operators of the airport consider that new development on this site is essential to ensure its long term viability, particularly given the overall reduction in flights over the last ten years"
6. The area is currently in the countryside and outside the Built Up Area Boundary. This is not changed by the Plan. It is also in the Adur – Lancing Green Gap (see Para 3.50).
7. Flood prevention measures (see para. 4.131) and major changes to the access to the A27 are required (see Plan Map 6) before the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 could be implemented.
8. Paragraph 2.96 says the proposal will require the re-negotiation of a legal (S52) agreement given at the time of the all-weather runway being allowed and binding the landowners not to develop the open area of the airport.
9. Because the Airport is a large open area between the Adur and Lancing the public paths and embankments along the river enjoy a pleasant outlook to the west. This is appreciated by visitors and residents. I personally take great pleasure in walking beside the river and over the Toll Bridge and for me these are the areas which I treat as my local park.
10. Walks beside the river are used by large numbers of people. The area is one of the most accessible, attractive public spaces in the vicinity.
11. The views can be appreciated by users of the A283 in both directions and westwards on the Upper Shoreham Road. Pub goers sit out at the front of the Amsterdam and Red Lion, which are venues for visitors, especially from the adjacent Downsway Trail.
12. The views and the walks are a characteristic feature of the Old Shoreham Conservation Area which extends both sides of the Upper Shoreham Road and includes the eastern riverside and the approach to the Toll Bridge. Map 1 (attached) shows the extent of this Conservation Area.
13. I particularly enjoy bird watching beside the river and the many overwintering birds are a special attraction. Some, notably Lapwings, use the grass areas of the airport as winter feeding grounds.
14. There is a great contrast between the open outlook over the Airport and the busy industrial area developed by Ricardo p.l.c. to the north of the Toll Bridge.
15. It is a fact that the freehold of the Airport is still owned by Worthing and Brighton / Hove Councils. These authorities could therefore have a financial interest in the outcome of the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7.
16. Of course Adur Council is independent of the two freeholders. But the Planning Department of Adur has moved to Worthing and the two councils have merged to the extent that, for some time, they have shared a Chief Executive and other functions. Their identity is "Worthing and Adur Councils".

17. I know that the Toll Bridge is Listed Grade II and its setting is therefore sensitive. It is also important that the area east of the river is the Old Shoreham Conservation Area, as mentioned. This includes the land up to the eastern footing of the Toll Bridge and the embankment, as far as the river shore, as well as housing and the mediaeval Church of St Nicolas.

18. The South Downs National Park is immediately to the north of the A27 and there are views from it over the Airport. I also visit places in the Park, such as Mill Hill and Lancing Clump, from time to time and know that these views would be made less attractive if the major business allocation shown in Policy 7 was implemented.

#### Illustrations

19. Several photographs are included to show various views towards the site affected by The major business allocation proposed in Policy 7. The positions are marked on Map 2 (attached).

20. Photos 1-3 . are a sequence along the Upper Shoreham Road from the junction with St Nicolas Lane (1) to Connaught Avenue (2) and the riverside (3). Locations 2-5 are in the Old Shoreham Conservation Area. They show the view west over the Airport. Appendix 1 shows how the alignment of the Upper Shoreham Road leads towards the the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 site.

21. Photos 4 and 5 are taken from the approach to the Toll Bridge from the east. They are both from the western end of the Conservation Area which is where the Listed Bridge begins.

22. Photo 4 looks Southwest from the southern side of the Bridge over the Airport towards the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7.

23. Photo 5, from north side of the Bridge and due north of the point used for Photo 4, looks Northwest towards Ricardo's.

24. These photographs demonstrate what I am concerned could happen to the views west over the Airport, south of the Bridge, if business development happens. The example of Ricardo's shows how the western side of the river, south of the Toll Bridge, could look from the east.

#### Conclusion

25. I am asking for the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 to be removed from the Draft Plan and the land sought to be found elsewhere in the District. That should be discussed separately but it is clear that there are other possibilities.

26. The Policy as it stands raises many questions including:

- a. What would the actual impact on views over the site be? I have put forward my concerns and it is noticeable that there are no professional visualisations of the impacts, only verbal assurances to 'minimise' impacts, not that they will be acceptable
- b. How would the (S52) agreement need to be altered to allow the site to be released and what are the implications of that?
- C. Who stands to benefit from the release and are there valid grounds for 'enabling development' here?
- D. What are the realistic alternatives to releasing this site and what would their impacts be in comparison?
- E. What is the most appropriate new junction design on the A27 and where would it be?
- F. Is the flood prevention scheme practical, and funded and when might it happen?

27. Most significantly, the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 would bring about major damage to local public amenities including the settings of the Toll Bridge and land in the Old Shoreham Conservation Area, important designated Heritage Assets.

28. I therefore ask you to remove the major business allocation proposed in Policy 7 from the next version of the Local Plan.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 267

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Having experienced severe drainage problems from Summer 2012 through to the early part of 2013 I am strongly objecting to the development proposals in the Adur Draft Plan for the New Monks Farm and Airport areas (Policies 5 & 7).

Building up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5) with a school, community centre, 10,000 sq metres of business development plus all the road infrastructure will create an absolutely unacceptable flood risk for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

The same applies to the 15,000 sq metres of proposed business development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

Here in North Lancing, we experienced 8 weeks of devastation last Christmas with serious flooding, loss of sewerage and gas and know instinctively that the agencies and developers simply cannot mitigate this flood risk in such a shallow fall flood plain - 4 feet fall across 2 miles to the Shoreham sluices. It's a planning policy built on lunacy.

The draft plan has absolutely neglected to take account of this Christmas flooding event which has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds of the ratepayers' money to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation will be impossible in periods of sustained wet weather, How much more proof is required?

If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area, whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters.

Even though on the south side, for 'technical reasons', Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan, any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park. All areas in Lancing are interconnected by one thing - a flood plain. The same 'technical reasons' must apply to New Monks Farm and the airport. I have absolutely no confidence in the experts' or developers' judgement that flood risk in this area can be mitigated for.

Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas and into the New Year and defend their action to Government to exclude this flood plain development from the plan.

Also, it is also completely unacceptable to contemplate a roundabout (Map7) on this stretch of the A27. The road is at over capacity now.

Seven years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected by the Highways Agency. This was the main reason a hearing upheld the decision to not approve the application.

If the A27 then was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes, how can it approve the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed. Together with the proposed roundabout, this is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council, its councillors and officers have no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its rate paying community.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 716

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Aircraft Operator

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

See email for attachments.

#### INTRODUCTION:

This response addresses pages 48 through to 55 of the Plan as far as it concerns Shoreham Airport. The Council may well already be aware of some of the aspects covered but the content of the present edition of the Plan and, particularly, its predecessor suggest that there may be some gaps in the understanding of Shoreham Airport, its nature and the criteria essential to aviation there.

The Airport has more or less been on its present site for about 100 years; it is the oldest public airfield in the country, in fairly continuous use for civil aviation apart from the periods of the two world wars, when it was used by the military.

My family was associated with, and had partly owned, the Airport since the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s and from 1950 through to 1970.

This response does not address helicopter operations as that is outwith my experience.

#### DEVELOPMENT:

There is an economic need for the development of the Airport, so that it may remain financially viable and thus continue to provide its benefits into the foreseeable future.

There is no realistic prospect of material commercial scheduled traffic; although air taxi, business commuters and small feeder-line traffic are possible. Previous attempts to operate scheduled services have not been successful, though that is not to say that they can never be.

It is important that the majority of development should be aviation related. Were it not to be so, the risk of deterioration of the 'Lancing Gap' would become significant; that is not desirable in any circumstances.

During the 1950s and '60s, substantial aircraft manufacture took place at Shoreham. Major parts of airliners and military aircraft were built there as well as complete aircraft. The flight simulator business at the Airport outgrew the available space, firstly moving to Shoreham (Riverbank Works) and then onto Lancing. The Airport employed over 500 people at that time.

At present, the Airport houses flying training organisations that cater for private and commercial pilots as well as advanced training (aerobatics, complex aircraft, classic types). There is a large engineering training establishment. Aircraft maintenance companies are based at Shoreham, as well as many others which support aviation. One significant, and much respected, non-aviation business is Ricardo, who have a hanger on the Airport as an extension to their long-established engineering works on the river bank north of the toll bridge. In fact, of the 350 or so businesses and operations based there, all bar about a dozen are aviation related - all employ a highly skilled workforce.

It is obviously important that it should remain so.

#### THE LOCAL PLAN 2013:

Access from the A27 at present is not entirely satisfactory; at peak times, entry to the Airport from the west and exit in either direction is unduly congested, largely because of the traffic lights timing. Tailbacks on the A27 are excessive. Obviously, had the M27 been completed, a large part of that problem would not exist.

Thus, whilst access is 'easy', a roundabout with no traffic lights would be much more effective, especially at peak times. That would, of course, not cater for pedestrian traffic and a footbridge or Pelican crossing might be necessary. CAA regulations would need to be respected, in view of the proximity of runway 02/20. The water level would presumably render an underpass impractical?

There has been discussion as to the location of a new roundabout on the A27 - either to replace the traffic lights by the Sussex Pad, or at a site near the existing North Lancing roundabout. The latter proposal would be only about 700m (under half a mile) from the existing roundabout and would seem to be impractical. Furthermore, it would mean that traffic for the Airport would have to negotiate what appears to be a narrow lane along the north side of the airfield. There are unlikely to be many heavy goods vehicles entering the Monks Farm estate, whereas there is a reasonable amount of heavy traffic to and from the Airport. Such vehicles obviously cannot enter from the southern entrance. It is also difficult to see why access to Monks Farm cannot be either from the existing North Lancing roundabout or from Grinstead Lane, either of which would be much more convenient for the residents, as well as keeping that traffic separate from the Airport traffic.

It is not clear that 'views to the National Park and Lancing College' have a significant effect on the decision by a business to locate at the Airport. Although it is important to preserve those views, they are unlikely to influence commercial decisions; good access and the presence of other aviation businesses are much more cogent reasons for a business considering location at the Airport.

It continues (2.84) that there has been an "overall reduction in flights over the past 10 years". That is true, and is most likely to be a result of the increase in taxation on fuel coupled with the recession over the last 5 years. From one year to the next, the weather can have a marked effect, but that usually averages out. Movement is still substantial in comparison to other general aviation airfields. In fact, in 2012 (54,764 movements) it was the busiest airfield other than those catering predominantly for airline traffic. It is restricted to 75,000 movements per annum and there is thus scope for an increase of 35% (20,000 movements) from the 2012 level. The type of aviation carried out at Shoreham does not normally produce significant noise and such an increase back to earlier levels should not be a problem.

It proposes (2.85) that the Grade 2 hangar to the east of the terminal building should be demolished. It was restored after war damage in about 1952, and is showing signs of its age. That being said, if the frame is reasonably sound, recladding it would bring it back into service as a good hangar, of a size and headroom to give easy aircraft access, and keeping it compatible with the Terminal Building.

It is concerned (2.86) with the views of the Airport from the Downs on either side of the River Adur. It is difficult to see that the proposal for hangars and workshops in the north-east corner would have any adverse effect, bearing in mind that, under CAA regulations, they cannot intrude onto the airside.

2.88 remarks upon the improvements to flood defences. The airfield was fitted with land drains in the 1930s but the tidal sluices into the river were neglected during the war (people had other priorities) and, as the sluice gates became jammed by flotsam, river mud backed up into the drains and they ceased to be effective. The legacy of the drains can be felt in the washboard effect when landing on runway 25, although that does give the undercarriage some exercise! Satisfactory tidal flood protection is obviously necessary, whether the airfield is developed or not. It comments on the 'delivery' of the new roundabout; it is not clear why one should need to be delivered instead of built in situ.

Noise impact (2.90) should not be a concern, assuming that the new industrial zone in the north-east corner is built on land well below the top of the dyke, along the west side of the river. Any proposal for industrial development in the north-west corner could possibly affect the proposed Monks Farm residential development.

2.92 and 2.93 discuss the visual appearance of the airfield when seen from the Downs; as long as the new buildings are properly designed and no significant change is made to the airside, there is no reason why any noticeable change should arise.

2.95 comments on interaction with birds. That is a problem common to all airfields and there is no reason to suppose that the proposed development should have any effect thereon, as long as the usual precautions are taken.

Policy 7 speaks of "aviation and non-aviation related" development. As has already been noted, almost all the activity at the Airport is aviation related. Should that characteristic be diluted, the attractiveness of the Airport to new businesses providing additional skilled employment would be reduced and the objective of the Plan would be frustrated.

It continues with the discussion of access to the A259 coast road. At present that is provided by New Salts Farm lane and the little tunnel under the railway. It is difficult to see that any improvement can be made other than at substantial cost and, as long as the connection to the A27 provides easy access, it would not be worth doing.

2.97 discusses "sustainability". It is not clear whether the use of this term in connection with building development means that the resulting developed site should be capable of lasting a long time (be sustainable) or that the site should be amenable to continuing development ad infinitum. The former is laudable which the latter is unacceptable.

#### THE MAPS:

Map 6 shows the airfield and its surroundings and indicated the proposed site of the development. The map is incomplete and thus somewhat confusing. It shows only the one runway (20/02) and the taxi tracks. The perimeter road is shown as though it were a footpath. A complete map is attached (page 4) for ease of reference, and it is strongly recommended that the other two runways (shown in green) and the perimeter road (white) should be clearly marked.

It will be seen that the proposed development site overlaps the taxi track. That might be satisfactory if the whole development were to be airside, although that would impose restrictions on movement which might themselves be unsatisfactory, especially for any business which was not aviation related. This, however, should not pose a problem as long as the architects and planners are familiar with the practices and restrictions of aviation; there is no barrier between airside and the main hangar of those to the east and west of the southern estate. Aeroplanes do need to be able to taxi from the hangars to the perimeter track.

Remember also that aircraft holding at K3 for runway 20 carry out their power checks at the hold, and a sensible distance should be allowed between the hold and the building frontage. This is to keep noise to a reasonable level and to avoid the prop-wash from the aircraft running up. Subject to agreement by the CAA, it might be possible to move the hold a little further south down the perimeter track, so as to keep it away from the buildings. In that context, it is important to remember that, whilst some aircrafts make a straight-in approach from a point a little to the east of the cement works, others - in order to maintain a clear view of the runway - carry out a curving approach from the downwind leg roughly round the A27 flyover.

Visibility thus needs to be maintained past or over the buildings from approximately due east of the hold all the way round through the north-west - to be able to see aircraft on a right-hand approach - although the proposed development should not present any problems in the latter case.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 838

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have extreme concerns and objections to the New Monks Farm (Policy 5), the Airport (Policy 7) and A27 proposals in the revised plan.

It is important that you note on your file items 4, 5 & 6 below.

As anyone would understand, if you have invested significant funds in your ideal home, in a secluded location, with complete privacy, surrounded by nature, open fields which abound with wild life, all which of could change at a stroke, you would be worried. We have the risk of losing hundreds of thousands of pounds of value in our property with absolutely no redress if the proposals proceed.

Such a development would severely blight our home and devalue it to a point where it could be approaching a negative equity situation.

Whether we could be termed 'nimbyies' or not; the proposed sites for development are totally flawed in terms of their sustainability and acceptability in every aspect.

Putting aside our very personal losses there are major concerns with the policies 5 & 7 proposals of the revised plan..

Because of these, we categorically object to both these developments

These are the reasons:-

#### 1) Flood Risk

Last winter from Christmas into the New Year, we also experienced severe water logging polluted by sewage and loss of toilet facilities. Our cesspool drainage was inundated for 8 weeks of that period. Southern Water, although not in their remit, kindly pumped out our cesspool 3 times to no avail because ground water levels soon inundated the cesspool after each emptying. Pumping equipment connected with this drainage tank was caused to fail which cost us some few hundred pounds to replace. We have lived here for almost 7 years and have never seen flooding to the extent experienced in our area.

We are currently surrounded by open fields/green space. We ask the question. If 600 homes and 10,000 sq m of business development are built around us just how can Adur justify this in terms of flood risk when so much concrete will be dropped into this very active and fragile flood plain. Is Adur happy to give us the Christmas experience as a regular event whenever we have periods of prolonged or heavy rainfall? Let alone the new builds who will experience the same flood risk to their new properties which will probably become uninsurable and as a result unsaleable.

Already the authority has permitted a golf course (whose owner and developer of it and the proposed development area has frequently boasted to local residents that it will never be finished and the area will be built upon), and an enormous football complex. Both these sites have severely affected the drainage of this area and, since we have lived here, we can see the change in the drainage levels as a direct result.

The proposed 15,000 sq m of business development on the Airport is unacceptable for exactly the same reasons. Every part of this flood plain is connected through the Lancing Brooks ditch network. Wherever you build will severely affect both upstream and downstream in such a shallow floodplain.

The golf course has a fall of less than 3" across its 173 acres. From the plan, at least 60% of the NMF development will occupy its western side up to Mash Barn Lane. We also understand that the golf course drainage scheme may not have been completed to the approved specification. 12 ponds, to relieve in wet weather the many ditches across it, do not appear to have been constructed. Unquestionably, this will have greatly contributed to the Christmas period flooding of this north side of the flood plain and ongoing flood risk.

There are key drainage ditches flowing north to south from the A27 on both sides of the Mash Barn Lane which ultimately connect with the Lancing ditch network across the so called golf course. Any attempt to alter these ditches and their flows in the name of design layout of the development is asking for trouble and culverting certainly is not a solution. Any culverts will mean that ground water flows will suffer even further and cause issues both upstream and downstream of the area.

Quite frankly, we have absolutely no confidence in the developer to provide a mitigation scheme because we know from living here, this simply cannot be achieved.

There are many examples nationally of just this situation where the agencies and developers have got it so wrong and the poor public has suffered greatly, all in the cause of unscrupulous profit gain with no recourse for those so badly affected. This is exactly the case for these proposed developments.

As rate paying residents, we demand that the NMF and airport developments must be excluded from the Adur Plan to ensure no greater flood risk than already exists and for our continued wellbeing and that of all the local properties here in North Lancing and around the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

## 2) Roundabout Developments on the A27 (Map 7)

All we can say to this is Madness! Madness! Madness!

How on earth can the additional traffic generated by both these sites be managed on what is a major trunk road at absolute capacity right now and getting worse.

We still have to see the effect of the additional daily traffic flows from the Albion football centre with its space for 300+ car parking spaces. Despite the highways approval, that will only add further delays and gridlock to this trunk road, one of the busiest in the country.

We understand that the Highways Agency has given comments with certain conditions that one of the roundabout options will be acceptable. Are they mad??!! Yes, we do need regeneration of the businesses already in the area, particularly in the Lancing centre. Adding this phenomenal increase of traffic into the area plus the further delays of a roundabout will guarantee the further downhill decline of the Lancing businesses already struggling to maintain their survival. We must look after their interests; which ultimately is to the benefit of the community living here.

Creating a situation like there is with the A27 around Chichester will guarantee that companies looking to set up in the region will not give us a second glance but steer well clear of Adur and Lancing particularly.

The inconsistency of the Highways Agency beggars belief. They successfully objected to a planning application for 100 houses on virtually the same area just 7 years ago because of the effect of increased traffic flows onto this Lancing stretch of the A27. And now they say the phenomenal increase from 600 house and high volume business developments and a school are acceptable!

They could not even get the drainage working when they carried out drainage improvement works on the same stretch for 3 months up to last Christmas. They failed to check that the outfalls were working but just assumed they were – and look at the road flooding that caused!

We have absolutely no faith in the Highways Agency.

If a roundabout is permitted, the only word for this is degeneration not regeneration!!

### 3) Loss of Wildlife

In both these areas there is a high level of wild life which use these natural green spaces and drainage ditches as their habitat. Frequently, roe deer are welcomed by residents in the Old Shoreham Road, They even come into their back gardens (see attached picture.), there are badgers(protected), foxes, invertebrates in profusion, protected water voles, crested newts (protected) lapwings (protected) - particularly around the policy 7 area, slow worms, grass snakes and innumerable species of birds.

Turning this area into building development will eliminate the habitat for these much loved indigenous species. They are another reason we decided to make our home here.

Restricting their presence to a limited bio diverse area behind the Old Shoreham Road will spell the death knell for these creatures. As part of their requirement to survive, many need to move uninhibited around the total green space which currently exists. This has already been eroded by the Albion complex. Being constricted to just the small 'bio area' mentioned with no chance to roam south or east because a building development is in the way will mean their ability to survive is at great risk and many will inevitably meet their demise..

We must protect our natural wildlife for future generations at all costs. If it cannot be protected in its own right – and we know that much of it can, then Adur has the arguments with drainage and infrastructure issues to prevent this damage to the wild life. They must exercise those arguments to the fullest extent.

I would imagine that part of the planning requirement for any development would be to check

- a) the financial viability of the developer
- b) check any financial charges which appertain to the land being developed.

In conclusion, we once again stress our strenuous opposition to the developments on New Monks Farm & the airport and the resulting roundabout. The councillors who represent the community here have no option but to listen to community concerns and delete these sites from the Adur Plan to ensure the wellbeing of us all. They must defend this robustly to the government inspectors.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 834

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

## RE DEVELOPMENT AT SHOREHAM AIRPORT

I totally object to this development for the following reasons:

1. All the area north of the main terminal building line is an area of outstanding beauty, there is nothing like it, not only in our area but in the country at large. It is largely because of the airport that this beautiful plot exists and it will be to the shame of the council if it allows any development in the area proposed.

2. The operators of the airport have no interest in general aviation and should have their interests ignored. The sooner they leave the better. They have recently for instance divested themselves of all responsibility for the running of airport operations and the management company taken over sees it in their interests to immediately put the landing fees up by 30% and the hangarage fees by 15%. This is because they want to subsidise the flight academy which they also own. In other words, the small owner operator such as myself can leave. I spend about £15000 with airport fees and maintenance done at Shoreham.

3. The airport is already suffering from loss of premises to low tech people like laundries. There is a lack of consideration given concerning existing buildings.

Laundries can be situated perfectly on the harbour development, they do not need to be at an airport. Similarly for travel organisations. Talk of aviation related development in the 15,000 square meters sounds like hot air when considering that a laundry and a travel company are taking up valuable aviation related buildings which your planning people allow.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 890

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing College

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Stiles Harold Williams

## SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHED LETTER WITH MAPS.

'A Strategy for Change and Prosperity' and the strategic allocation at New Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport in particular matters relating to the proposed junction arrangement in Options 1 and 2.

Please see attached letter dated 5th November 2013.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 825

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

Dear Sir/Madam,

Could I ask that the following concerns that I have regarding the above be included in the consultation file. Also would you be kind enough to confirm you can accept it and add it to you file. Thank you.

I have serious concerns and objections to developments on the New Monks Farm (Policy 5), the Airport (Policy 7) and A27 proposals in the revised plan.

I can only object to these proposals which will severely affect our quality of life. Having lived here for many years in this tranquil environment, surrounded by fields and wildlife to be surrounded by a 600 home development, a third of which will be 'affordable' (social) housing plus 10,000 sq m of business development will absolutely decimate my well being which has already been damaged by the approval of the football complex just south of us.

Irrespective of my personal situation the Adur Plan by inclusion of both the New Monks Farm and airport areas is totally flawed in every aspect. Apart from the adverse affect on the quality of life for the whole area including mine, these proposals simply do not comply with the NPPF for the following very obvious reasons:

1) Flood Risk

If 600 homes and 10,000 sq m of business development are built here, how can the local authority justify this in terms of flood risk. You do not have to be a drainage expert to realise that when so much concrete is dropped into this very active and fragile flood plain, the water logging we experienced at Christmas for 8 weeks into the New Year will become a regular event. Any prolonged period of heavy rain will mean not only flooding of existing properties but all those homes which are being proposed.

I know that mitigation in this high risk of flooding area will not be possible as has been proven so many times elsewhere with the flooding of New Builds in flood plain situations where agencies have approved developer's solutions which have failed totally and miserably to the complete detriment of the community. If this development goes ahead, properties will be uninsurable and therefore unsaleable.

The proposed 15,000 sq m of business development on the Airport is unacceptable for exactly the same reasons. Every part of this flood plain is connected through the Lancing Brooks ditch network. Wherever you build will severely affect both upstream and downstream in such a shallow floodplain.

I understand from the plans that up to 60% of the proposed New Monks Farm development will be located on the western section of what is meant to be a golf course. Already it has been established that despite building up the land, 12 key ponds to mitigate for when ditch levels are high have not been completed. This inevitably was contributory to last winter's drainage problems. Building up to 300+ homes in this area is pure madness! The drainage fall across the whole of the golf course site is under 3 inches! This is the key wetland area which should be let to flood in times of bad wet weather. Only devastation will result if building is permitted.

As a rate paying resident, I think that the NMF and airport developments must be excluded from the Adur Plan to ensure no greater flood risk than already exists and for my continued wellbeing and that of all the local properties here in North Lancing and all around the Lancing/Shoreham flood

plain.

## 2) A27 Roundabout (Map 7)

This major road is already at over capacity now. How on earth can the additional traffic output from the NMF and airport developments be acceptable to the Highways Agency with a roundabout on the A27. I cannot believe that any 'improvements' can help ease the situation, it can only get a lot worse.

We have still to see the effect of the additional traffic flows from the football complex let alone these proposed developments.

If this goes ahead I can only foresee gridlock and flooded roads as a result .

I have no faith in the Highways Agency if they find this to be acceptable, particularly after their management of the improvement works last Autumn which resulted in worse flooding on the Lancing stretch of the A27.

## 3. Decimation of the Wildlife

The whole flood plain is full of wildlife, whose habitat is already eroded by the building of the football complex to the south.

Many species, a lot of them protected by law are present in this area. Once again, despite the planners' words of managing the outfall for wild life from such developments, these poor creatures will only suffer if these totally inappropriate developments proceed. Many animals need the whole area to forage. With confinement to a so called bio diverse area many will not survive and with a large building development preventing their movement across the Lancing Gap will only mean one thing – their total demise!

We must protect our natural wildlife for future generations at all costs. If it cannot be protected in its own right – and we know that much of it can, then Adur has the arguments with drainage and infrastructure issues to prevent this damage to the wild life. They must exercise those arguments to the fullest extent.

## 4. Residents access rights for vehicles and pedestrians using Mash Barn Lane to and from the A27. This applies to everyone who lives on this lane.

We ask that you register these legal rights on your files. If the NMF development is approved for the plan, I and my neighbours will defend any situation where the developer tries to change the access status we have because he wishes to create an alternative road system and the Mash Barn Lane ceases to exist exactly as it is now with its and our direct access to and from the A27.

## 5. Ownership of Mash Barn Lane

This road has never had a registered owner. New Monks Farm Developments have assumed ownership if you examine their title plan for the site owned by them. I and my neighbours are actively disputing that this road belongs to them and are developing a legal counter claim for shared ownership with appropriate authorities.

Please note this on your files. We shall be challenging NMF Development Ltd's claim of ownership.

Finally, I once again stress our vehement opposition to the developments on New Monks Farm and the airport and the resulting roundabout, none of which conforms to the NPPF. We insist that councillors who represent the community here must listen to community concerns. These sites must be deleted from the Adur Plan to ensure the wellbeing of us all. This must be robustly defended to the government inspectors.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 824

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Our Concerns on the Adur Draft Plan - Policies 5&7

Dear Sirs,

Having found a house to our liking, we moved from Surrey to North Lancing 20 years ago to this address which was most tranquil and ideally located between the coast and the wonderful South Downs. In the middle nineties, during the month of January, each year we started to notice the presence of surface water in the corner of our front garden - at that time to a depth of 1/2" . Neighbours informed us that it was water from the many springs in the area. Then to our horror we had 4" in both the front and back gardens. Assistance was needed from the water company who, using a large pump situated on my neighbour's forecourt, pumped the flood water into a drainage culvert which outfalls into a drainage ditch behind both our houses. This ran both day and night, and we can assure you was far from noiseless. Manor Close, a neighbouring road experienced the identical problem. Furthermore, it is now well documented by West Sussex CC and Adur DC that from the 21st December 2012 there were severe drainage problems which affected the whole of the Lancing Manor area south of the A27. Our toilets were out of use most of the time. We had large tankers, often 4 at a time in our road, pumping out water, 24 hours a day for almost a further 8 weeks. Our sleep was affected with the noise. Our front and back gardens were under 6" of water for days, our the garden was flooded and sandbagged for most of that time and unusable. Our front door was sandbagged for weeks.. The inconvenience to our daily lives was immeasurable and quite frankly in a modern society, totally unacceptable. And the ratepayers had to fund the many hundreds of thousands of pounds for the emergency and remedial works involved. So, you can imagine how we (and our neighbours) all felt when we read that a substantial number of buildings are being planned for the area- a proposal which appears to be residing in the realms of insanity - for development in this flood plain! The volume of development proposed on New Monks Farm and the Airport is absolute madness! The Lancing Shoreham gap is a very slow flowing flood plain- Filling it with concrete is simply not an option! The Lancing Shoreham Gap must be left as a natural, functioning flood plain with no inhibition of drainage flows because of profit motivated building development.

Adur must delete these elements from the draft plan - not to do so will mean that the recent Christmas event will become a frequent occurrence. Residents will have problems obtaining insurance cover, both existing and for the new builds. The community's quality of life will deteriorate because of the stupidity of the council members who were elected to look after our wellbeing. Next May's local elections will certainly see some radical changes we are certain if these elements in the plan prevail. In respect of the two roundabout options on the A27 - words can only fail! And the Highways Agency will be happy for one of them to be created! Already there is an increase in the number of 44+ tonne lorries moving both ways between Southampton and Dover with the latter port's new harbour scheme.. The manoeuvring of these large vehicles at times is terrifying on local roads which were originally designed for pony & trap users.

If the developments did go ahead, with the housing, business development areas, community centre and a school, the additional volume of traffic using this already over capacity trunk road defies belief. It must amount to the addition of many thousands of vehicle movements daily on and off the A27. At present it can take as long as 5 minutes to exit Grinstead Lane at Manor Roundabout to travel east along the Mill to return home, waiting for a break in the west flowing traffic flow. We dread to think how much longer this will take with constant flowing traffic from one of the proposed new roundabouts with no break at the Sussex Pad lights to the east! I hope that the council members understand that the flooding in December/January this year, and we are both in our 80s, we live in complete trepidation that any sustained periods of wet weather will only increase the problems occurring from the inhibited flow of surface and ground water if the flood plain development proposals are permitted to go ahead. If our council has a conscience, as representatives of this community, we, as rate paying residents demand that these flood plain developments be completely deleted from the plan in the interests of our personal wellbeing and that of the whole community.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 823

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Albemarle (Shoreham) LLP

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Savills UK (Planning)

SEE HARD COPY OR EMAIL FOR FULL COMMENTS/LETTER & ATTACHMENTS (DEVELOPMENT VIABILITY ASSESSMENT etc).

These are only summarised notes below.

- Representing Albermarle LLP in regards to strategic allocation at Shoreham Airport.
- Development of 30,000 sqm of employment floorspace at the Airport would have necessitated the closure of the two grass runways and the kilo taxiway - essential to the operation of the Airport.
- 'North west' development could be safely delivered without unacceptable landscape impact (supporting evidence attached).
- Development at Shoreham Airport will have significant knock-on effects on surrounding area (e.g Lancing College, Ricardo, Northbrook College etc).
- Serious doubts about the ability to provide a new access to the A27 with New Monks Farm development and Airport.
- Jeopardises the City Deal initiative, which identified the Airport as a key Growth Hub.
  
- Is the plan viable? No justification.
- Failure to provide certainty and confidence to developers.
- Fails the test of soundness.
- The 2011 Employment Land Review (ELR) identifies the Airport as one of the few areas that can attract high value activities owing to easy access to A27. This could be compromised.
- Plan cannot support the provision of a new access to A27. New access would need to be covered by public funds, developers at New Monks Farm or by other developers.
- HA will only allow one access onto the A27 to serve both Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm. Access would deem the airport unattractive for occupiers to locate to due to the significant downgrade of access at Sussex Pad junction.
  
- Downgrading or closing A27 access would have negative impact on future viability of airport, Ricardo, Lancing College, Northbrook College, commercial units at Airport and viability of future commercial aviation ventures at Airport.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 741

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The West Beach Estate are living on a flood plain and cannot sustain any more building locally. If this does happen we will flood. We suffer enough already with surface water flooding our roads and having to paddle through ankle deep water to get to our homes. The flood plain protects our homes.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 747

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

No more building on our flood plain, the flood plain protects our homes flooding. Any more building and we will flood. I will hold WSCC & Adur District Council for any negligence as a direct or indirect result in excess building on the flood plain that results in flooding into my property.

Which part of the words 'flood plain' do the WSCC & Adur District Council not understand the full meaning of? Where on Earth do you think the excess flood water will end up?

The Plan is totally irresponsible in its entirety & should not have even been suggested in the first place. Total disregard for our environment.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 748

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Building on proposed sites would be a mistake because you already know this area is a flood plain.

Already the traffic backs up severely on the A259 and A27 at rush hour (which extends beyond an hour). The risk of flooding would be increased and West Beach Estate would bear the brunt of the problem. The BHA training site is already having problems with high water. The drains, which are holding a lot of water, would probably flood or block with rubbish and building materials from developers and residents of new homes, causing an increased likelihood of our area flooding. Will the council take responsibility for our damages when this happens? Why not build less houses in smaller areas, rather than large estates likely to cause problems further down the line?

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 756

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

These areas are all part of a flood plain. Further building will cause major flooding.  
Let's think about the infrastructure now!  
No more building.

Think about the birds, animals, views and walks. Look elsewhere for further housing.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 788

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation PerryAir Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AT SHOREHAM AIRPORT.

A) Again the area is a flood plain and a tidal wall will not protect the area from rainfall flooding, water draining for the Downs and Spring water, also reducing the area available for ground drainage.

B) The Lease holders of Shoreham airport insist that the new industrial area is essential to ensure the longterm viability of the airport.

- There are numerous empty industrial buildings at the airport.
- The revenue for the industrial buildings doesn't and will not go into the running of the airport. There are now two separate entities.
- The views from the South Downs will be interrupted and an area of special scientific interest blemished.

Both Monks Farm and Shoreham Airport developments will only add to the already over congested A259 and A27 which have become almost unusable at certain peak times and are always busy at any time.

This already detracts from the area and will cause further distraction, misery and frustration to established business and residents in the locality.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 780

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Our lovely airport. Will runways be reduced? It is the oldest airport in England, please don't spoil it.  
Children and grown ups have many happy hours watching the planes, don't take this away.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 846

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to vehemently object to the Adur Draft Plan for the developments proposed within the Lancing Gap (Policies 5 & 7). This Gap is a very active, fragile flood plain.

Building 600 homes, 25,000sq m business sites, a school and a community centre plus all the infrastructure of roads and services will create horrendous problems for the communities in Lancing, particularly those that are situated on the perimeters of this highly sensitive area. Filling the flood plain with tons and tons of concrete will spell disaster for us all.

Did the council learn nothing from the bad events suffered in North and South Lancing from Christmas 2012 into the New Year? The cost to the ratepayer has been in the hundreds of thousands of pounds, irrespective of the 8 weeks of hell that residents suffered. Sewage polluted flood water in your property was totally unacceptable as was loss of gas and the continual inconvenience of tankering for 24 hours a day week in and week out.

How can Adur put its rate paying community at even greater risk. Have they not realised that climate change is creating longer and heavier periods of rainfall to levels where the natural infrastructure of the South Downs and the Lancing Shoreham Flood Plain simple cannot cope?? !!

As for the madness of proposing a roundabout along the Lancing stretch of the A27 (Map 7) – this is simply unbelievable. It won't be just more unacceptable pollution and more accidents – it will be absolute gridlock with the phenomenal increase of traffic using the road from the proposed developments. How the Highways Agency can approve this when they objected to only 100 homes 7 years ago on the same site because of increased traffic affecting and accessing the A27. It was their objection which overturned the application.

There are other concerns. The proposed New Monks Farm and Airport areas are full of wildlife. This wetland area is a wonderful habitat for many species including many which have statutory protection. The bio diverse area is really not as good as it sounds. Many of these forage across the whole area and confining them to a few acres behind the Old Shoreham Road with no access south and east because of a large development will mean these creatures will not survive. Already a large part of their habitat has been eroded with the Albion football complex which is now well advanced.

In conclusion, I am registering my very strong objection to the above developments and roundabout which will far from regenerate but degenerate the area of Adur and particularly Lancing.

I am insisting that these elements be withdrawn from the plan, that the planners work harder to examine other opportunities within the area which are less damaging to the well being of the community and the natural habitat and to re-examine the numbers being projected which I believe are doubtful.

Our elected members must reject these above developments and strenuously defend their decision to the government inspector in the interest of the well being of the community in this district.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 924

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am a resident living north of the flood plain and wish to strongly object to the planning applications for New Monks Farm development, Policy 5 and also Policy 7 the Airport development.

I cannot understand how these policies can be countenanced, especially after 8 weeks of flooding, loss of sewerage and gas experienced by Lancing residents last Christmas and New Year.

The draft plan has conveniently neglected to take account of this and the thousands of pounds spent attempting to rectify all the problems, indeed some of the work is still ongoing. I have lived in Manor Close for some 20 odd years and on many occasions tankers have had to be employed continuously to deal with water problems when rainfall is heavy. In view of the fact that the flood plain is so shallow, it seems to me to be sheer madness to go ahead with these policies, thereby further exacerbating an already existing problem. It will put all residents within this area at risk of further severe flooding and disruption.

I know the council is under pressure from the Government to build more houses but surely not to the detriment of existing rate payers.

The traffic on the A27 is already over capacity and since the building of the new college at Grove Lodge is even more notorious for causing very long delays. More cars from more properties would further increase delays, and replacing traffic lights with a roundabout means there would be continual traffic flow making it very difficult for me to access the A27 (Map 7). I understand that 7 years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected mainly because of objections by the Highways Agency, so how can the road suddenly be capable of sustaining vastly increased traffic now?

There must be no more building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District must listen to residents concerns and defend our arguments to government inspectors.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 12

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment regarding the proposed development on the “New Monks Farm” site and a further development planned for the north east side of the airport. I notice these developments appear to be creating quite a ‘stir’ as evidenced by the recent articles in the local newspapers and the objections raised by several resident’s associations.

The reasons for this email are twofold; firstly I wish to voice my strong objections and opposition to these proposed developments and secondly I wish to seek answers to a few questions please.

I have to admit to being very surprised that such ambitious developments are being considered so soon after the floods which wreaked havoc on the community of Lancing only 9 months ago. As these floods were attributed to the precarious environmental factors in the area I am further surprised that these developments are being considered especially as the root causes of the problems appear to remain unresolved. It seems a little nonsensical to add to the problem by increasing development without first resolving the underlying flood dangers.

My home was one of the unfortunate victims of the recent flooding where raw sewage, lack of gas and excessive water served to make for a thoroughly unpleasant Christmas for my family and many of my neighbours. The cause of this flooding appears to be the fragile flood plains in and around the Lancing area and the delicate balance between nature and mans inability to mitigate against her forces by over developing this obviously ‘at-risk’ area. You can hopefully understand therefore, my concerns that despite clear evidence that the flood plains have already been over developed, further development is being considered. Put bluntly, these developments will do nothing but exacerbate the already delicate balance in this area.

This proposed development has simply failed to take into account the displacement of ground and surface waters which leads me to my first question please. I would be grateful if you could explain your reasons, cited as “technical”, for no longer including Old Salts Farm as part of the development. If it is as a result of flood issues, as I suspect, then could I please ask that you accept that the entire flood plain is all interlinked and inter-connected and the plans to remove large chunks of the flood plain and replace it with concreted development will do nothing but compound the workings of a flood plain that has been proved to be insufficient in dealing with water drainage under current infrastructure arrangements.

Surely you must acknowledge that that the shallow flood fall in this area (4 feet:2 miles), combined with the fact that existing agencies appear to be unable to mitigate flooding and that residents have already experienced severe flooding demonstrates the peculiarly delicate balance of the area and that any further development must first address this flood issue. Given that the issue has not been resolved under the existing infrastructure footprint I fail to see how it will be improved by exacerbating the problem with more development. Put bluntly, it would be lunacy to continue to develop on an area that has already been proven to be broken.

I apologise for coming across so strongly here but the memories of the Christmas floods are still very vivid in my mind and the thought of serious flooding, loss of sewage and gas due to over ambitious development agendas makes my emotions run high.

Given the significant local objections to these proposed developments I would be interested to know how you intend to compensate residents if their concerns do indeed materialize, as I fully expect they will. I am particularly interested in how you intend to offset the inevitable higher insurance premiums and the equally inevitable drop in property prices brought on as a result of this self induced flood risk. Could I and other residents expect a drop in our council tax premiums to cover our additional costs and loss of revenues for example? I think I can speak with some authority that we

are now beyond “potential” risk to “evidenced real” risk. Your proposed development will surely, based on recent events, simply increase future flooding in the area and I have seen nothing in the proposed plans to convince me otherwise.

This leads to my final question please which relates to culpability. Put simply, I, like many others who are objecting to these developments and who have lived through flooding in this area, would wish to be reassured that any future developments will not contribute to further floods. Indeed, I would like to know what measures are being put in place to not only mitigate future flooding but more importantly eradicate future floods. Have you, for example, invested in, or instructed the developers to pay for, “independent” ecological surveys to assess the area for further development with regard to the flood plains. I am concerned that without these “independent” and “unbiased” specialist reports, then development will be approved based on profit margins rather than ecological impact statements. I stress the need for these reports to be independent and specialised; independent for obvious commercially linked reasons but also specialised to ensure the peculiar and unique nature of the area is fully considered by experts.

Ultimately, I want to know who is the person who will potentially give the go ahead for these developments because I for one will be extremely angry if development goes ahead and floods continue. It would make for an interesting legal case if any potential future flooding and their resultant damages could be linked to an individual or individuals not listening to and taking sufficient steps to mitigate flooding particularly in light of such strong local opposition and combined with such compelling evidence of previous flooding. I would like it recorded that I would much prefer you to spend my tax money on investigating how the flood plains can be repaired so that developments can be considered in the future rather than spending my taxes on the inevitable mopping-up operations and lengthy legal battles as a consequence of individuals who failed to listen to public opinion or specialist advice.

Moving on from the potentially catastrophic consequences of flooding, I see that the developments include the addition of a roundabout on the A27 in this same area. I am advised that some years ago (approximately 2006) a similar development of only 100 homes was rejected by the Highways Agency due to traffic density. I regret I don't have the time nor the inclination to research this in detail but I suspect that traffic density will have only increased since 2006 and that this would be compounded by the new development particularly as it is considerably more ambitious than 100 homes. Common sense surely must dictate that if the roads were not able to support 100 homes how on earth can they support 600, plus amenities, plus a large business development plus an inevitable uplift in traffic – it just does not make any sense at all. The road is already congested, particularly at commuter times, and this slowing down of the road by placing obstacles in it in the form of roundabouts will do nothing but congest it further. Once again I must reiterate that I simply fail to see the sense in this proposal other than to support a development that has not been thought through?

In summary, whilst I accept the proposed developments may potentially be a lucrative proposition for some I would urge that common sense over profit prevails and existing residents are not subjected to further hardship as a consequence of ill informed decisions by the very people who are in office to protect my, and my neighbour's, interests.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 507

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

With reference to the Mind the Gap survey my answer is that

Any building of property on the land in the surrounding area would be detrimental to the area because of the flooding which has proven traumatic for a lot of people in the roads around the proposed site, some more than others due to raw sewage actual internal ingress to bungalows, Which has become worse since the site fill for what is supposed to have been a golf course has since been overfilled, this was always a natural flood plain drain off point and by building / banking all the earth there this has made the flooding many times worse than before by diverting surface water westwards towards manor close and surround properties

There is also the wildlife to consider as the fields within the planned works are all natural breeding and feeding grounds for various creatures including Deer Badger, Rabbit, Foxes and Ducks along with some birds i.e. Sparrow hawk, Kestrel and Woodpecker along with Jays and some others.

My other concern would be the idea of extra traffic along the A27 and Grinstead lane, these two roads alone are heavy with traffic at any time of day but adding more at peak times could and would be totally chaotic and cause even more delays than at present but then only someone who lives in this area would see and understand this. Besides the above I feel that we need the strategic gap as a part of the natural break between the villages and towns

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 13

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am writing to object most strongly to the proposed development on New Monks Farm and the Airport together with the roundabout proposals for the A27.

The plan makes absolutely no recognition of the severe drainage issues we experienced here in North Lancing over last Christmas into the New Year. I personally suffered tremendous hardship living in the lowest part of Manor Way. Not only did I lose use of toilet facilities but my garden was under 6 inches of water for much of the weeks of the event.

My garage and its contents which included a washing machine and a freezer were also flooded similarly. Fortunately they were on raised up areas above the water level and no damage was actually sustained to these appliances, although the electrical risk with so much water around was of great concern to myself. Loss of accessibility to both appliances was total and quite frankly unacceptable.

We live on the edge of a slow draining flood plain. It does not take a rocket scientist to know that the suggested developments on New Monks Farm (immediately to the east of here) and the airport will only further impair the surface and groundwater drainage in the area. The flood plain is what it says it is - an area where drainage can accumulate in periods of heavy wet weather without severely affecting the areas around it.

As our District Council I must insist that these two developments must be excluded from the Adur Draft Plan. The residents' wellbeing in the Lancing area must be looked after and not allowed to be sacrificed to developers whose only objective is to make enormous profits at the expense of the local community and move on leaving us unable to arrange insurance cover and in constant fear of the consequences from the sort of terrible event we experienced over last Christmas. As for the idea of creating yet another roundabout on this already overloaded trunk road, this beggars belief.

Once again, as a long term resident in this area, I (and my neighbours) need your reassurance that the above proposed developments will be totally excluded from the plan and the reasons why vigorously supported to the government inspectors.

The Lancing/Shoreham gap must be preserved with no further development at all costs to ensure the wellbeing of the local community with no increased risks.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 67

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The A27 Lancing/Worthing is already at full capacity and any further building on the area is clearly unacceptable with the present infrastructure. The road did in fact suffer flooding last year so any further building will aggravate the problem.

This area is in fact a flood plain and further building should not in any way be considered.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 506

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Lancing Manor (S.E.) Residents Network

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

See Email for photograph attachments.

Dear Members and Officers,

Following our recent emails on our concerns for increased flood risk by the proposed inclusion of high levels of development within the flood plain of the Lancing Shoreham Gap for the Adur District Plan, we feel we must give you our comments regarding the river flooding of the Airport last Thursday and Friday.

This incident was to do with the breaches of the banks of the River Adur because of exceptionally high tides. We know that the Environment Agency is enhancing the river and coastal flood defences with a £28 million scheme starting next year. Irrespective of this, when you bear in mind that the ICCC projected a rise in sea levels of 80cm in the coming decades, once again, it really can only be a foolish step to allow any building on this flood plain.

This event is clearly another indication of the folly of further development in this fragile area.

For your reference two photos are attached taken on Friday 6th Devember. The first shows the flooding on the north east area of the airport where 15,000 sq m of potential business development has been featured in the plan. The other gives a view of the effect to the area immediately in front of the main terminal building where aircraft can be seen with their undercarriages in the flood waters.

Once again, in the interests of the community, we ask that the elements of the Adur Plan which permit development in this flood plain must be deleted. This flood plain should be left as it is, to be allowed to flood in exceptional circumstances of prolonged rainfall with heavy ground and surface waters or when events like the one experienced last week occur.

Whilst the consultation has now passed its deadline, we feel that this email of concern should be included on the file and would welcome your confirmation that this has also been logged as comment.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 16

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We wish to register our serious concerns and objections to proposals in the Adur Draft Plan which is now in public consultation. Firstly, we are extremely worried about the increased flood risk which will inevitably be caused by the two developments suggested for building on the New Monks Farm and the airport within the Lancing and Shoreham Gap in what is a highly sensitive flood plain drainage area.

Last Christmas for a period of nearly 8 weeks, this location in the north of Lancing experienced the worst drainage issues ever to be experienced for the area – loss of sewerage, gas and flooding of gardens, garages and in some cases, homes. Areas to the south also suffered severe road flooding because the flood plain area was at over capacity.

Building 600 houses and 25,000 sq metres of business development with a school and community centre is the very last thing which must be allowed to happen in this extremely fragile flood plain drainage area.

The shallow drainage from here to Shoreham sluices, a minimal fall of just 1: 2,000, is barely coping in periods of sustained wet weather now, even if all the network of ditches is kept maintained.

To cover all these many acres with concrete by the developments on both New Monks Farm and the airport is simply asking for trouble. The draft plan acknowledges there are drainage issues in some areas but totally fails to take into account the severe event last Christmas here in north Lancing or indeed the very slow groundwater and surface water drainage across the two miles of flood plain.

I have considerable experience in the creation and maintenance of ditch and culvert drainage. I know that there is absolutely no foolproof way to mitigate for the prospective building outlined in the plan in a flood plain with only a fall of little over 1 metre in 2 miles for such a network of ditches. I certainly have no confidence in a developer who is proposing this to create a solution when the only real motive is make vast profits and move on leaving residents and the owners of the new builds with serious problems.

This development is absolute madness, unless the Adur authority is happy to continually disrupt the wellbeing of the local community and frequently invest the many hundreds of thousands of pounds it was forced to spend last Christmas and into this year for emergency drainage and remedial works.

We are adamant as ratepaying residents that these two areas must be excluded from the plan.

Adur DC has all the evidence of the Christmas event to support their exclusion with the government planning authority. It must have the strength to defend this position vigorously with any government inspector. Even David Cameron and Owen Paterson have mentioned the foolhardiness of building on flood plains and the NPPF categorically states it should be avoided.

As long term Lancing residents we demand that this flood plain development must not happen.

As for the A27 this is just totally illogical. The Highways Agency have turned down considerably smaller developments in the same area because of untenable traffic impacts on this over busy dual carriageway. Now they are happy to accept the increased traffic from 600 homes and businesses

and to boot, create a roundabout junction to deal with this??!! What madness is this??!! Just look at the A27 around Chichester! No more needs to be said.

As our local authority, we insist that Adur District Council has no option but to put the well being of its residents first and exclude these developments and the A27 options from the plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The need access across A27 at the Sussex Pad junction prevents a westerly relocation of the junction

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 921

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As a resident who lives north of the flood plain I would like to object to the planning applications for the New Monks Farm development, Policy 5 and also the Airport development, Policy 7.

Over the Christmas period we experienced 8 weeks of flooding, loss of sewage & gas supplies, having lived in Manor Close for over twenty years I can assure you this is not the first time this has happened, on many occasions we have had to endure pumps in our road for weeks on end, we feel that the draft plan has neglected to take this into account.

Building up to 600 houses with a community centre, school and 10,000 sq metres of business development plus the road infrastructure will only increase the on going flood risk in this area, this land must be allowed to work as a flood plain to retain excess water during periods of wet weather. As a side note I would like to add that our house insurance renewal which we received this month is almost £1000 which is a 400% increase on last year, this is due to the flooding problems over the winter. I wonder how the new residents of this potential development will react when they realise the costs involved in insuring their homes built on a flood plain.

I am well aware that local government is under pressure to build houses, but to build on an area that has been and still is at great risk of flooding is difficult to understand, drainage problems in this area are still to be addressed.

Also this particular stretch of the A27 between the Shoreham flyover and the Grove lodge roundabout in Worthing is notorious for heavy traffic and long delays, to add to this by creating a further possible 1,200 cars is very worrying, we travel every morning from our home to the grove lodge roundabout which is 3 miles. This short journey takes on average 30 minutes, if we take the bus this journey is then 50 minutes. Also by replacing the traffic lights at the Sussex Pad with a roundabout (Map 7) this will increase the problems for us accessing the A27 due to no break in the traffic.

In the interests of all the residents in Lancing, there must be no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain, and I hope that Adur District Council defends this argument with the government inspectors.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 9

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I would like to express I do understand Adur's need for more houses, etc, but the real question where is it most appropriate. Where current homes experiencing flooding and is known as flood plane area - shows this land is not really suitable. I do feel there is land available which can accommodate the whole Adur Development Plan which should be considered first.

Building up to 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site (policy 5) with a school, community centre, 10,000 sq metres of business development plus the road infrastructure will create an unacceptable flood risk for existing residents who all reside within the northern, western and southern perimeters of the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain flood plain.

The same applies to the 15,000 sq metres of proposed business development on the north eastern side of the airport (policy 7).

As a resident who lives north of the flood plain, having experienced 8 weeks of devastation last Christmas with serious flooding, loss of sewerage and gas I know instinctively that the agencies and developers simply cannot mitigate this flood risk in such a shallow fall flood plain – 4 feet fall across 2 miles to the Shoreham sluices. It's a planning policy built on lunacy.

The draft plan has absolutely neglected to take account of this Christmas flooding event which has cost hundreds of thousands of pounds to remedy and for which work still continues. This event categorically proves that mitigation will be impossible in periods of sustained wet weather. How much more proof is required? Remember this is NOT the first time.

Adur DC must listen to all the residents who suffered so badly on the north and south sides of the flood plain over last Christmas into the New Year. If this vast infill of concrete is permitted in such a fragile area, whatever is built within the flood plain and wherever it is located will put all residents who live around it at risk with displacement of ground and surface waters.

Even though on the south side, for 'technical reasons', Old Salts Farm is no longer included in the plan, any development elsewhere on the flood plain will still put at risk areas such as West Beach and Willowbrook Park.

The same 'technical reasons' apply to New Monks Farm and the airport developments and they must be taken out of the plan

Throughout the flood plain, drainage problems will affect everyone – they are all interconnected by this fragile, wetland area which must be allowed to work as a flood plain to retain excess water during periods of wet weather.

I have to say out of the 5 years I have lived in this area 10% of the time I have experienced problems with flooding, building more houses in area where the chances of flood have increase (up to 75% chance of flooding) is a invitation for more problems with flooding. I would say it unfair of Adur council expecting their residents to live like this!

In terms of infrastructure, it is completely unacceptable to even contemplate a roundabout (Map7) on this stretch of the A27. The road is at over capacity now.

Seven years ago a previous planning development on the same site was rejected by the Highways Agency. This was the main reason a hearing upheld the decision to not approve the application.

If the A27 then was incapable of sustaining the additional traffic from just 100 homes, how can it approve the vast increase from the 600 houses and businesses/a school which now are being proposed.

Together with the proposed roundabout, this is a total lack of inconsistency bordering on stupidity.

I feel A27 should really have some traffic control measures - a drop from 70mph to 40mph - its obvious motorist do not take any notice of the speed limit - especially the motorbikes as they see this stretch of the A27 as an initiation to put their foot down. This stretch of the A27 should have more speed control mechanisms.

In the interests of the well being of all the residents and their families in Lancing, there must be absolutely no further building on the Lancing/Shoreham flood plain.

Adur District Council has no option but to strenuously defend this argument with the government inspectors to ensure the wellbeing of its ratepaying

residents.

I would like to ask a question why other flood plane/flood risk areas have been excluded but not New Monks Farm where the same principles apply. I believe a president has been set - no building on Flood plane land including New Monks Farm !

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 925

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are writing to object in the strongest possible way to the Adur Plan with the proposal to build 600 houses on the flood plain between Lancing and Shoreham.

My wife and I, along with all the residents in Manor Way, Old Shoreham Road, Manor Close, Grinstead Lane and even properties on the Mash Barn Lane on the New Monks Farm site itself suffered unacceptable problems over two months during the Christmas 2012 and into the New Year.

Why is it that the area you propose to build all these houses on is recognised as a FLOOD PLAIN by everyone including yourselves, so having accepted this how can you in the remotest possible way even suggest that this plan can go ahead.

B&H Albion was granted planning permission for their academy, with the assurances that this will not have any affect on the flooding problems. This is yet to be proved. Just suppose, because of the concreting that the buildings and car park of the academy needs to have, this leads to any increase in the flooding problems in all the above roads.

What will you be able to do about this? I will tell you NOTHING. Because the damage has already been done with your blessing, against the wishes of the residents that you are supposed to represent.

Now you want to do the same again! Where on earth is your justification for this? We realise that you have been actioned to build a certain amount of houses by the government and even those numbers are questionable and need re-examination, but you just cannot disregard the people you represent and just knowingly condemn them to more misery.

As for the proposals for the A27 (map 7) and another roundabout, words absolutely fail us!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 938

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Serenus Aviation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Please note that although my address for correspondence is in Otford, Serenus Aviation is based at Shoreham Airport.

I believe it is essential if the Airport is to continue to thrive, that access to and from the Airport, both to the east and to the west is maintained. If the existing junction is not to be replaced by a roundabout and the traffic lights are to be removed, then adequate slip roads in both directions, both eastbound and westbound, must be provided.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Para 2.87 repeats the identified need for safe and improved pedestrian and cycle access across the A27 into the national park (see New Monks Farm: para 2.57 above), and, again, we welcome this and its incorporation into Revised Draft Policy 7.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As previously highlighted development at Shoreham Airport is reliant on provision of the Adur Tidal Walls defences. This may have implications for phasing. We are therefore pleased to see that the supporting text gives a clear overview of the current flood risk for the site and its reliance on the Adur Tidal Walls scheme.

However, it should be noted that only reaches 6 and 7 (including the lagoon) need to be completed to close the flood cell, rather than the entire west bank stretch. We would therefore recommend that the first sentence of the fourth paragraph should be changed to read:

... "no development shall take place within the allocated area until the relevant section of the Adur Tidal Walls on the west bank have been completed." The particular detail about reaches 6 and 7 could be included in the supporting text.

The approved business case for the Adur Tidal Walls scheme (total cost £26 million) which will protect Shoreham Airport is very strong, and the EA have started detailed design. However, DEFRA funding is allocated year on year so timescales cannot be guaranteed and contributions will be required. The EA are actively pursuing external contributions which will further add to the business case for the scheme.

In paragraph 2.91 – please change 'implementation phase' to 'detailed design'. The text should make it clear that delivery of the Tidal Walls is dependent on funding which is allocated year on year.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 20

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I wish to register my objection the developments as outlined in the above council's draft plan as follows--

#### 1 Flood Plain

Frankly it can only be described as irresponsible to even consider building on this flood plain that has been an integral part of NE Lancings drainage sluice for many generations.Last winters alarming flooding in our area will serve to illuminate how delicate the drainage situation is across this entire neighbourhood.The large concrete footprint proposed will surely act as a catalyst for even worse problems for us and our children.

#### 2 Climate Change

Has anyone considered this, and if not why not?

The recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted that the way we are behaving ambient temperatures are likely to rise a max of 6 Deg C in the next century.This will result in sea levels across the planet rising by a maximum of 80cm!!So why are you even considering building on this area which is vulnerable to flooding now ,let alone in years hence when the water levels will inevitably rise.The IPCC is not a wishy-washy green protest group it's constituent members are the cleverest scientists in the world who were nominated by their respective governments.

Are these developments to be carbon neutral?

Is AD/W Council doing anything constructive to reduce the amount of hydrocarbons they generate?

#### 3 Traffic Congestion

Currently the stretch of the A27 from Lancing through to Worthing is one of the very worst bottlenecks in the Home Counties.With an additional 1000 odd combustion engines emptying out onto it daily will result in gridlock additional pollution and failed urban infrastructure.

#### 4 Ecology/Environment

The proposed development area may look to us as being only flat and uninteresting but it is the vital supporting habitat for a diverse no. of our precious wildlife including--

x Eurasian Badger--Protected under the 1992 Badger Protection Act.There is a listed sett to the NW of the area--The Badger Trust will be making further representations on this at a later date.

xRoe Deer--A small no. of these indigenous mammals rely on their foraging in this area,and are becoming increasingly isolated--protected by the 1980 Deer Act and the 1996 Wild mammals Protection Act.

xBats--My bat detector has picked up the ultrasound signals of several types of this protected species (1981 WCA) in the Monks Farm Lane area adjacent to the deserted buildings on the E side.

xWater Voles--Protected again under the 1981 WCA,the free flowing streams in the area are known for being one of the few areas in Sussex where these precious mammals can be seen

xBirds/Water fowl--The Saltings mud flats to the adjacent E is a bird sanctuary and a wide range of our feathered neighbours seek sanctuary there,as they do on this flood plain--All wild birds and there nests are protected by the 1981WCA

Etc Etc

The draft plan depicts a relatively small 'area of ecological enhancement' where it is assumed that all the many displaced protected species will be corralled up together next to the deadly A27!--which is obviously ridiculous and probably illegal.A country park area is also outlined but no essential

green 'wildlife' corridor is shown connecting the two fenced green areas..

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 22

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are writing about the proposed plans for building more homes and business development in the Lancing area (Policies 5 & 7). We would like to express our serious concerns regarding these plans.

We feel that if this goes ahead there will be even more concerns about flooding to the area. Since moving here we have learned about the terrible problems with loss of sewerage and flooded properties which many residents experienced over last Christmas into the New Year. Frequent repetition of this must be prevented at all costs. Adur must delete these proposed developments on the Adur flood plain from its plan if it has any concern for its rate paying residents in Lancing..

Also the amount of traffic this will bring onto the A27 which is a large car park already. would be totally unacceptable. Our concerns are we live on the A27 and already we have problems exiting our property onto this extremely busy trunk road. By putting a roundabout near us this will cause a continual traffic flow and even more problems for us to exit our property – made worse by the thousands of additional vehicle movements from the proposed new developments.

As our final word - we are totally against these developments which will effect the environment around us and the reasons why we moved here from Suffolk a couple of months ago.

Adur must delete policies 5 & 7 from their plan in the interests of the community's well being and have the strength to support this with the government planning agency.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 917

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am completely opposed to the elements in the Adur Strategic Plan noted as Policies 5, 7 and Map 7.

How on earth can the Environment Agency say that flood risk can be mitigated for the New Monks Farm proposed development after last Christmas's 8 weeks of devastation to this area in North Lancing? This agency was party to dealing with this extreme crisis together with all the other agencies and local authorities.

This is a grade 3 flood area and must never be built on further for either the wellbeing of existing residents who know what it is to be affected by severe drainage and sewage issues, let alone any proposed new builds who will be lucky to even get insurance.

Over last Christmas, I was on a BBC TV South's main news item pumping out floodwater from under my floorboards. Surely such images are enough to persuade Adur and its councillors just how neglectful it is to even propose such development. They have a duty of care to the rate paying community which by publication of this draft, they have totally failed to observe.

Adur District Council has no option but to exclude the New Monks Farm and airport developments from the plan. I, as a resident demand it, the local community here demand it. They must never allow a repeat of another event like residents suffered at the start of 2013.

I live on the A27. What world do these professionals at the Highways Agency live in? Some years ago they objected to a 100 homes development behind where I live because of the traffic effect on the A27, now they are happy to approve the significant additional traffic volume from 600 homes, a school and business developments on the same site??!! Furthermore, they are happy with an additional roundabout on this already over capacity trunk road. I need say no more but just look at the same road around Chichester.

I personally have no faith in this agency, particularly after the so called drainage improvement works for 3 months running up to last Christmas. The outcome as we all know was the worst flooding ever experienced along the Lancing stretch of the A27!

This development on the A27 must never be allowed – it is illogical, it will cause gridlock, it will cause accidents and it certainly will not promote the regeneration of this area, more likely the degeneration of Lancing.

Adur District Council must exclude any further development on the Lancing – Shoreham Gap and in the interests of our well being strenuously defend their action to the government inspectorate.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 526

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The flood plain adjacent to a tidal river and airport requires serious geological expert investigation. I would suggest a Dutch consultancy firm provides a report before any building work is undertaken. Clearly the sluices and ditches are totally inadequate for the current inflow from the north. Only huge water pumps installed in purpose built canals can shift these amounts of water.

In England, this was carried out in the 16-17th Century to reclaim large land areas in Norfolk and around the Wash.

There are websites for dutch firms who use their expertise gained from many years in Holland to demonstrate their abilities.

A number of natural springs flow under this plain towards the sea. A first class example in this area is the spring at Fulking, which has flowed since the 1930s and probably before that without cease into the roadside there.

Who pays? A combination of Government and potential developers with a small cost to Adur and West Sussex should cover a professional survey. Any other work could prove to be prohibitive.

That is my contribution and I hope it may prove useful to solve our number one priority in Lancing, for the residents who have suffered CONTINUOUS flooding and damage over many years. It seems that they are now being inflicted with higher insurance premiums, as the area is known by property insurance companies. Many are elderly residents and can barely afford the huge costs.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 882

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Airport

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I note there is no mention in the plan to have a park and ride scheme near the Aerodrome that was talked about a few years ago. This would greatly assist in traffic management locally and provide sustainable movements for all persons in the local area and the Aerodrome in sustainability going forward.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 2

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I note your map of the airfields does not show the grass runways or helicopter training areas.

Please make sure you take these into account .

The grass runways are very important as various types of aircraft have to land into wind using these runways.

The helicopter training areas one near Monks Farm are also most important and need to be considered.

Finally the airport operator has put up landing fees to a level that airport use will dwindle, obviously the operator has no interest in the airport and wants it to fail so that vast areas can be developed and a large profit made.

It is essential that the airport is not allowed to be priced out of use !!

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 769

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am completely opposed to policies 5, 7 and Map 7 in the Adur Strategic Plan.

Despite what the Environment Agency say, flood risk cannot be mitigated for the New Monks Farm proposed development. How can they even think to say this after last Christmas's 8 weeks of sheer hell to this area in North Lancing? This agency was involved in dealing with this extreme crisis together with all the other agencies and local authorities so they should know precisely the terrible problems we had.

This is a grade 3 flood risk area and must never be built on further for either the wellbeing of existing residents who know what it is to be affected by severe drainage and sewage issues, let alone any proposed new builds who will be lucky to even get insurance or obtain a mortgage. The impact will be not just dwellings west of the proposed New Monks Farm development but all the community in Lancing who live around this very sensitive flood plain.

Adur District Council has no option but to exclude the New Monks Farm and airport developments from the plan. I, as a rate paying resident demand it, all my neighbours in the community demand it. They must never allow a repeat of another event like residents suffered at the start of 2013.

I live just off the A27. How can these highly skilled, highly paid professionals at the Highways Agency even attempt to agree with what's being planned?!

7 years ago they objected to a 100 homes development behind where I live because of the traffic effect on the A27. Where is the consistency? They are now happy to approve the significant additional traffic volume 600 homes, a school and business developments - on exactly the same site?! To make matters worse, they are also prepared to agree to uet another roundabout on this road which is already running at over capacity - hence the many traffic delays.

I personally have no faith in this agency, particularly after the so called drainage improvement works for 3 months running up to last Christmas. The outcome as we all know was the worst flooding ever experienced along the Lancing stretch of the A27 because they totally failed to prove the drainage outfalls in the start up plan.

If you want to add to the degeneration of Lancing, then go ahead - this is just the right way to ensure businesses and people avoid coming here because of the severe traffic situation it will cause.

This development on the A27 must never be allowed - it is illogical, it will cause gridlock, it will cause an increase in accidents and it certainly will not promote the regeneration of this area.

Adur District Council must exclude any further development on the Lancing-Shoreham Gap, preserve our green spaces for the community and for that matter, the country and the interests of our wellbeing, vigorously defend their action to the government inspectorate.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 892

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Airport Consultative Committee

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### APPROACH:

As per previous consultations, the Committee has no comment on housing matters as it is outside its remit other than noting that housing is required for local residents who would work in the employment space.

Our response is principles based, noting that various parties will have detailed views on specific points.

#### KEY POINTS:

- We are fully committed to the principle of the airport being a commercially viable, growing and active airport.
- Any on airport development must respect the above and not degrade that ability to operate all three runways and their support infrastructure to meet current and future regulations.
- To that end all future developments including road infrastructure which supports the airport must ensure they meet the same requirements.
- To enable employment growth on the airport land it is essential that road and flood defence infrastructure is in place prior to significant developments being open. In our view these are all very overdue.
- It is essential that all water displacement issues for the airport and the siets to its west are addressed so that a holistic solution is provided as part of the whole provision of infrastructure.
- We support the idea of development of land on the NE corner of the airport, but are concerned that the land allocation for employment has significantly reduced on the airport and in other parts of Adur. Without sufficient land allocation for employment across the District we are concerned that the economic growth needed will be constrained.
- We would encourage the 15000m2 allocation being increased with environmentally sensitive design.
- We support the work being done to secure early progress on flood defences as part of the Great Brighton City Deal and the ideas behind the Shoreham Growth Hub.
- With regards to the need to upgrade the Sussex Pad Junction, which is essential for the hub to be viable and to encourage more airport users and visitors, we make the following comments:
  - East west access on both sides of the junction is essential for both the needs of the Airport, Northbrook staff and students and Ricardo as well as those of Lancing College and others using the Coombes Road and for access to the National Park.
  - The junction needs to be as far east as is possible, noting runway approach issues and design constraints of the dome and travellers site - complex and long access roads will materially increase inconvenience to airport users and visitors and reduce development viability.
- We wish to see improved sustainable transport access to the airport and would support an on airport bus route and also note the need for west bound cycle routes along the A27 into Worthing which need to be in place as soon as possible - both these would reduce parking pressure on the airport. Improved pedestrian access to the South east corner is also needed for the many students and other users who come from Shoreham.
- Improved access to the A259 is also needed.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 895

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Redfly Aviation Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I object to any development within the airport boundaries, especially at the proposed site. Any building here would reduce the green gap and create an eyesore from Lancing College and from the South Downs National Park, as well as other parts of Shoreham. The problem of flooding / drainage has been addressed in the Plan, but I am not convinced that these measures will be adequate. I also fear that any development on the given site will interfere with the operations as they currently exist, and these must be unchanged in accordance with the leases granted to Albemarle until 2043 at least.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 527

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

My husband and I live in an extremely busy road, which as is the case, got much worse in the last 20 years. Please, please do not consider building housing and extras in the Shoreham Airport area. We have suffered with sewage overflowing, constant traffic outside our house and on the A27. We fear that the extra traffic that would arise would be unacceptable. This is already quite a built up area. Although we are somewhat 'connected' by the Downs on the north of the A27, that doesn't mean that housing has to be 'squashed' along the south side of the A27/ The fear of constant flooding to the East of us, is unacceptable and fears that this would become much worse if this development takes place.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 8

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We would like to register our objection to the above-mentioned proposed plan.

Building a further 600 homes on the New Monks Farm site ( Policy 5 )with a school, community centre & 10,000 square metres of business development plus the road infrastructure will create an extra unacceptable flood risk for all the long suffering existing residents of Lancing and Shoreham.

The same applies to the proposed Business Development on the north eastern side of the airport ( Policy 7 ).

We live north of the flood plain and experienced 8 weeks of utter misery last Christmas because of serious flooding and loss of the use of toilets.

The area is already designated as a high probability (3a) flood zone. We cannot begin to comprehend what measures any developer or agency could take to reduce the risk of flooding. Surely adding dwellings, a school and business developments can only exacerbate an already untenable situation.

This is planning policy that shows no rationale. On the face of it, it would seem that the real concerns of the residents are simply not being taken into consideration – it is almost as if they do not matter. Put another way, it seems that the council have not thought out the consequences and the implications of the proposal enough, and if the plan were to be approved they would subject even more people to abject misery.

Regarding infrastructure, it is complete madness to even contemplate a roundabout ( Map 7 ) on this stretch of the A27. The road is already inadequate for the current volume of traffic it has to handle. Seven years ago a similar scheme was rejected by The Highways Agency. If it was incapable then of coping with the additional traffic from a hundred homes what circumstance in the interim period has changed so that it would now ( miraculously ) cope with the traffic from six hundred homes, a school and a business development ?.

Additionally, it would be a lot more difficult for those residents who live alongside the A27 to access their homes

In the interest of the well-being of all the residents of Lancing there must be no further building on the Lancing / Shoreham flood plain.

Common sense dictates that Adur District Council should seriously consider the welfare of all its Council Tax Payers and propose an alternative plan that does not involve building on the flood plain.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The A27 Sussex Pad junction is also used by equestrians, any improvements here should also provide for their use.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 07: Shoreham Airport

Reference No. 894

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

There can be no justification for industrial development on the airport site while there are vacant and under-utilised industrial buildings in the Shoreham, Lancing and Worthing areas. In particular existing buildings on the airport are inappropriately utilised.

The plan predicts a reduction in industrial activity and this is indeed likely due to the high costs of operating in the South of England. The plan itself therefore proves that this development is unnecessary. Providing facilities for high technology companies adjacent to the Ricardo plant could undermine the employment costs of Ricardo through competing for rare engineering expertise.

The proposed buildings will have no positive impact on the airport since the proceeds from rental of the airport properties are siphoned off into the coffers of a property development company.

Para 2.38 is clearly rubbish. "Although the manufacturing sector in Adur has been performing relatively well, traditional manufacturing across the region has generally been in decline in recent years and this trend is set to continue. Therefore, it is important that a range of employment land and premises are provided in the district to help strengthen the economy". In effect this paragraph states that manufacturing is in decline so NEW buildings are required to provide employment. Surely the net floor space required to maintain employment remains fixed and therefore consideration must be given not to more property but to efficient change of use?

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Character Area 07**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Character Area 07

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Character Area 7: The first bullet point sets out an approach to assessing development proposals for the Western Arm. However, whilst the Western Harbour Arm Development Brief has been adopted by Adur DC, West Sussex County Council has not adopted or endorsed its policies because of its potential conflict with the West Sussex Minerals Local Plan (2003). As a key member of the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Partnership, the County Council broadly welcomes an approach to planning that provides businesses, developers and investors with increased certainty. The development briefs have addressed previous comments raised by the County Council regarding the principle of safeguarding mineral wharves within Shoreham Harbour, however, details of the release / replacement of wharves is not included and should be addressed through the JAAP and the review of the West Sussex Minerals Local Plan. Until that time, Policy 40 of the Minerals Local Plan (2003) still remains the adopted planning policy for safeguarding wharves within the harbour and the briefs should not be afforded weight in determining planning applications on safeguarded wharves. The County Council is committed to working with the Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Partnership to ensure an appropriate policy approach is included in the JAAP and Minerals Local Plan.

The County Council is in the early stages of preparing a Minerals Local Plan to replace the current adopted Plan, with technical evidence work ongoing at present. Of particular importance to future development at Shoreham Harbour will be the Wharves and Railhead Study. The outcomes of this Study will form an integral decision making tool in the development of the JAAP.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.112**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.112

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

2.112: The final sentence refers to the authorities 'currently preparing guidance' in relation to the implications of the safeguarding of sites at Shoreham through the Minerals Local Plan (2003). However, there is no current intention to prepare such guidance. The most accurate description of the current approach agreed by the County Council is set out within section 5.2 of the Shoreham Harbour Western Arm Development Brief.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.113**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.113

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.113: It should be noted that the transport strategy will be prepared to support regeneration at Shoreham Harbour.

The Transport Study will also inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Strategic Infrastructure Package for Adur.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.116**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.116

Reference No. 914

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Could the existing site be brought up to date and even increased to cover these measures.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.119**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Para 2.119

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

2.119: The County Council will adopt the JAAP, so please remove 'endorsed'

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

In order to support leisure and youth water activities, there is a need for an all tide public slipway with good vehicle access on the harbour.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 987

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Natural England

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We note that no mention is made within the policy for Shoreham Harbour, with relation to the SSSI or SNCIs that are in the area, although there is mention of enhancing the western arm of the harbour with Green Infrastructure. Natural England would like to see these protected sites more prominently and positively mentioned within the policy wording for the Harbour area.

As mentioned in our previous response, it is relevant that marine habitats and (of course) water quality issues are considered with relation to the harbour development, however this doesn't come across to strongly in the policy wording.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 76

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The plan for Shoreham Harbour is not nearly bold enough.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 8 Character Area 6: 'comprehensive restoration of Shoreham Fort' - input from English Heritage needs to be acknowledged to take this forward.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 35

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Shoreham Harbour

All new homes should be sustainably built and designed to be as carbon neutral as possible.

An accessible walkway and cycleway needs to be developed between Wharf Road, Basin Road South and Lady B Marina including waterside facilities and bars/cafes, independent shops etc.

The huge tidal range could be harnessed to produce renewable energy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 976

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As a past contributor to previous draft (and abandoned) plans, and also as an invitee to two of the Harbour Regeneration Plan workshops, I feel I must show my appreciation of the problems the planners face, and all the work that they have put into the latest plan.

It is a long document, and regrettably I do not have time to read every word, nor to marry up my comments with the specific relevant parts of the published text. So, of necessity they are going to be general.

Shoreham is a unique and precious place, that has still not been completely ruined by development. I refer to the core of Shoreham, ie St Mary's church, the surrounding old streets, the Sussex Yacht Club (all that's left of the many shipyards that used to be on the river), and of course the beautiful curving Adur estuary. Also, though not part of the built environment, I would like to specifically include the houseboat communities – both at the Surry boatyard, and on Riverbank. The latter is larger, and arguably has a more interesting collection of boats from a historic point of view. Do make sure the Plan recognises and conserves these features.

Secondly, I seem to remember at one of the meetings I attended, that a significant green part of the airfield was to be earmarked for industrial development. OK, I know there is pressure to provide more jobs (see below) , but I believe the airfield should be maintained as a 'strategic [green] gap'. Do try and maintain this status, otherwise one new building will lead to another, which then leads to another ...

On several occasions I have expressed my wish to see the mile long stretch of the western harbour arm, be made more interesting and sympathetic to the river running through it. The 7m tidal range is a challenge, but it should be possible to make things far more nautical, and to re-capture some of the area's previous culture, by breaking up the line of steel piling with inlets, pontoons (housing galleries, cafes etc), and slipway(s). It would also be a great idea to restore one or more of the passenger ferries that used to operate in the vicinity of the lifeboat station. This also provide better continuity in the coastal path, which currently has to divert onto inland urban roads for the aforementioned mile or so.

Lastly, I have to express my concern about central government's relentless pressure to force Councils to provide more housing in the south east, whilst the rest of the UK has surplus housing. This is bad enough, but by also insisting on more factories and places of work, we are in effect creating a greater magnet to attract still more people to settle from the rest of the UK. This spiral will have to be broken one day – the sooner the better, though I recognise that this is a hurtful sentiment for youngsters born locally, who are looking for work.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 887

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The Co-operative Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Barton Willmore LLP

#### BACKGROUND

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (“the Co-op”) and have been instructed to submit representations to the consultation on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013. This follows the submission of representations to the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan in October 2012.
2. The Co-op is an important stakeholder in Adur District, operating Town Centre ‘Co-operative Food’ stores in Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Lancing. These stores all perform important anchor roles for their respective Town Centres, generating trade, footfall and associated spin-off benefits for other retailers, in turn providing a valuable contribution to Town Centre vitality and viability.
3. Against this background, we set out our comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013 and its performance against the soundness tests contained at NPPF paragraph 182.

#### Part 2 – A Strategy for Change and Prosperity

#### Policy 8 – Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

4. The Co-op notes that the Policy has been revised and now only explicitly supports small scale ancillary retailing at the Harbour and only as part of its wider residential development.
5. The Co-op supports the revised Policy.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are pleased to see that new development will be expected to meet high standards of environmental efficiency. Given the historic uses in this area land contamination is likely to be a significant issue for new developments. We therefore recommend that reference to land contamination is added within paragraph 11 alongside local noise and air quality. We consider the supporting text to this policy gives a good overview and clarity of the need and requirement for flood defence infrastructure. And that this is also reflected well within the Policy. We support the inclusion of point 5 within the section of the Policy for Character Area 7: Western Harbour Arm.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 891

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Southern Water

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Southern Water welcomes the recognition in Revised Draft Policy 5: New Monks Farm, Lancing and Revised Draft Policy 6: Land at West Sompting for the need to connect to the local water distribution and/or sewerage systems at the nearest points of adequate capacity. It is disappointing that such provision is not made in Revised Draft Policy 8: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area, in line with our previous representations.

We welcome the support to 'identify and where appropriate accommodate the future capacity requirements for the Waste Water Treatment Plan' contained in Character Area 1. However, the local sewerage and water distribution infrastructure also needs to be considered in relation to proposals at Shoreham Harbour.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) details the importance of a proportionate evidence base in the preparation of strategies for housing, employment and other uses. Paragraph 162 specifically requires an assessment to be made of the quality and capacity of infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands. Southern Water has undertaken an assessment and there is currently insufficient capacity in the local sewerage network to accommodate the proposed level of development at Shoreham Harbour. Therefore, as our previous representations stated, off-site infrastructure would be required. Connection off-site is the mechanism by which developers can provide the infrastructure required to service their sites. However, Southern Water has limited powers to enforce such connection. There is therefore a risk that the necessary infrastructure will not be delivered in time to service the development, unless delivery is supported by the Local Planning Authority in planning policies and subsequently in planning conditions. If the necessary infrastructure is not delivered, both new and existing customers would experience poor levels of service, for example, poor water pressure or poor drainage.

We consider that policy provision is imperative as this is the basis for determining planning applications according to legislation and Central Government advice contained in the NPPF. Paragraph 157 of the NPPF states that Local Plans should 'plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework'. Paragraph 177 of the NPPF also outlines that it is important to ensure that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion and infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time on the Local Plan.

Furthermore, it is important to give early warning to prospective developers regarding the need to connect off-site, as it will add to the cost of the development. Ofwat takes the view that this type of local infrastructure provision should be paid for by the development as they would directly benefit from it. This protects existing customers who would otherwise pay through increased general charges. Early warning will facilitate delivery of the necessary infrastructure so it can be incorporated early in the planning process. If the infrastructure is not delivered, the sewers would become overloaded, leading to foul water flooding and pollution of the environment.

One of the core planning principles contained in the NPPF is that planning should 'proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs'. Overall, the lack of policy recognition for the delivery of off-site sewerage infrastructure could adversely affect the deliverability of the Local Plan and sustainable development.

The Regeneration Area is currently served by multiple water distribution and trunk mains, as well as numerous sewers and four pumping stations. It is important that this infrastructure is protected so that it can continue to fulfil its function. Appropriate easements will be required to secure access to the infrastructure for future maintenance and upsizing purposes.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 906

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation EMR

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We note that the Draft Adur Local Plan suggests that in regards to Shoreham Harbour the "ring fencing of the area be removed" and proposes that 1050 houses be included in "Adur's overall proposed housing targets".

We would formally object to any such proposal which could result in sensitive receptors such as housing being constructed near to our site.

Indeed as previously highlighted we are very concerned that the Councils Planning policies continue to assume that EMR and GB Oils will in the future be willing to vacate their sites at Shoreham. This is without identifying any alternative locations for these businesses.

Nor are we aware of any suitable sites identified in Worthing or Adur in the West Sussex Waste Plan.

For clarification and having spoken to GB Fuels both of us have previously made it absolutely clear that we have no current plans to move from our sites. The council should not assume otherwise.

We have both invested substantial sums in our sites and we provide an essential service to local businesses and individuals.

We want to work with the Council however I cannot emphasise enough that the EMR Shoreham Metal Recycling Facility is a very important site both for us and Adur / Worthing.

It makes up a large component of the waste recycling capacity in Adur and Worthing. Recycling large quantities of the local arisings of metallic waste and representing a major investment for ourselves which we will need to take every step to protect.

We do not share the Councils opinion that a phased development of the area can be achieved. The allocation of 1050 houses in this area therefore seems to be based on an incorrect assumption and we would strongly question its deliverability.

We repeat our very strong concerns that the Plans only make passing reference to the possible effects arising from the ongoing operation of certain businesses but fails to take any account of these potential effects in the plans. Proposing the premature zoning of land for residential development without resolving the constraints.

The very fact that these two businesses in particular will be continuing in occupation for the foreseeable future will lead to severe restrictions on any developments that are not reflected in the plans. Due both to the effect of of the oil terminal and the HSE guidance on safety zones as well as the potential issue of noise in relation to our site.

We also have serious concerns that in the meantime policies are being proposed / introduced such as suggesting that you will only grant temporary planning permission which will restrict the site's ability to modernise and achieve the highest standards.

We would urge you to reconsider the premature zoning of this land for housing or ensure that an alternative location in Adur or Worthing be identified for the EMR facility either in the Adur Local Plan or the West Sussex Waste Plan.



Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 973

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sustrans

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### KEY ISSUE 7 (p13)

The need to address road congestion and related pollution – air and noise – whilst improving the existing transport network.

The Active Travel Strategy from the Department of Health and Department for Transport (February 2010) argued that putting walking and cycling at the heart of local transport and public health strategies will improve public health, tackle congestion, reduce carbon emissions and improve the local environment.

The vision, objectives, and policies do not place sustainable transport at the heart of the Adur Local Plan. The overall impression is that sustainable transport is regarded as a mitigation measure to manage increasing levels of congestion and air pollution. Long-term, strategic investment in sustainable modes of transport has the potential to deliver against a far greater range the ALP's objectives. Moreover, using the Government's own methods of assessing the economic benefits of transport schemes, Sustrans has shown that local walking and cycling schemes have a benefit to cost ratio of 20:1. In times of severe budget restrictions this sits in stark contrast to the typical ratio of just 3:1 for other transport schemes such as rail and roads.

The comments that follow illustrate these points.

Waves Ahead – The Sustainable Community Strategy (1.38: p14)

Investment in measures that would make walking and cycling an attractive travel choice would contribute to all the objectives of the 'Waves Ahead' sustainable community strategy:

The health and well-being of active travel;

The social inclusion that comes with making walking and cycling a safe and affordable travel choice for people of all ages and abilities;

The economic benefits of reducing congestion;

The environmental benefits that would help to make Adur a better place to live.

Active, sustainable transport needs to be at the heart of the Adur Local Plan if this potential is to be realised. A clear strategic vision is critically important and Sustrans would like to see this recognised in the vision and objectives of the ALP.

In the current environment funding comes from a variety of sources and decision making is devolved to a number of different bodies. Without strategic direction and commitment, there is a high risk that spending on sustainable transport is piecemeal; schemes are not planned in a joined-up way; and value-for-money is not achieved and benefits to the community are not realised.

Travel Behaviour Change Programmes (Appendix RD10)

Travel behaviour change (TBC) programmes (p217) could be run across the whole of Adur to meet an objective of modal shift to sustainable modes of transport. It is not clear what evidence supports the statement that travel behaviour change programmes "have the greatest impact... within and around the development sites" (p217). Placed in this Appendix, it would appear that TBC programmes are viewed purely as a mitigation measure to help manage increasing levels of congestion. This sells short the potential benefits and value for money that might be achieved. Significant benefits against a wider range of objectives might be achieved by running TBC programmes within existing urban areas across Adur.

Junction Improvements (Appendix RD10)

"Highway mitigation schemes are required for nine of thirteen key junctions" (p217). By managing congestion at these points, road transport becomes a more attractive option. No evidence is presented to show that the congestion (and associated problems such as air pollution) is not shifted to other points on the road network. Sustrans would like to see:

A cost-benefit analysis comparing the value of these highway mitigation schemes against investment in sustainable modes of transport.

An assessment of ALP objectives that are met by the highway mitigation schemes compared to investment in sustainable modes of transport.

The observation is made that in West Sussex a number of highway mitigation schemes, while managing greater volumes of traffic, have been detrimental to cycling.

#### Strategic Cycle Routes

While specific junctions have been identified for mitigation measures (Appendix RD10) and 'proposed roundabout options' drawn up (Map 7, p54), measures to improve sustainable modes of transport are mostly generalised statements of intent with caveats such as "where feasible".

Sustrans would like to see included in the Adur Local Plan a commitment to develop high quality cycle routes in two key areas to improve access into and out of Shoreham. This would be consistent with other policies in the Adur Local Plan: Revised Draft Policy 13 (p92): "Improvements to green infrastructure, including pedestrian and cycle links, will be supported". Revised Draft Policy 26: The Visitor Economy (p121). "Access (including new footpaths, cycleways and slipways) to the river, the coast and the South Downs National Park should be improved where possible". Shoreham Harbour Regeneration (p63): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path that links the new Adur Ferry Bridge with Southwick Locks, suitable for both leisure and utility cyclists. This would become the new alignment of National Cycle Network Route 2, rather than the existing inland route.

Shoreham Airport (p51): A commitment to develop a high-quality off-road cycle path between North Lancing and the Adur Tollbridge. An improved cycle and walking crossing of the A27 to link the Old Shoreham Road and Coombes Road to provide access to Lancing College, the South Downs National Park and Steyning. A signed cycle route through the Airport linking the Downslink Path at the Adur Tollbridge to National Cycle Network Route 2 east of Widewater Lagoon.

The proposed roundabout changes at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm (p54) should be designed with high-quality cycle routes as part of the brief. The designs presented in Map 7 (p54) would appear to be designed to manage increased traffic levels. Designs that also make cycling a more attractive travel choice would also help to manage the levels of traffic.

#### Cycling in Urban Areas

Sustrans would like to see a policy commitment in the Adur Local Plan to make urban areas more attractive to cycling so that a bike ride is a safe, quick and affordable travel choice for trips to local amenities. This might include:

Designating or upgrading suitable footpaths as shared-use space, such as the existing link between Nicolson Drive and Middle Road in Shoreham.

Introducing cycling contraflows on one-way streets, such as in East Street, Shoreham.

Reducing speed limits on all residential roads to 20mph.

In the same way that specific road junctions have been identified, mitigation measures could be identified to remove barriers to access on foot or by bike to important destinations, such as schools, health centres, railway stations, and shops.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 974

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Brighton & Hove City Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The City Council welcomes the recognition in paragraph 2.112 of the importance of Shoreham Port for the landing, processing and handling of minerals, and that development proposals affecting minerals wharves are required to demonstrate that there is no net loss of capacity for handling minerals within the port. However the relevant policy in the East Sussex, Brighton & Hove and South Downs Waste and Minerals Plan is Policy WMP15, not WMP14. The City Council also points out that the reference to waste planning authorities should be to mineral planning authorities. The issue of the appropriate protection awarded to minerals wharves is likely to be resolved through the production of the Joint Area Action Plan following the completion of the updated West Sussex Wharves and Railheads study. West Sussex County Council will no doubt advise further on this subject.

Leading up to and following the recent Examination into the Brighton & Hove City Plan the City Council has proposed a number of main modifications to Policy DA8 – Shoreham Harbour. A schedule of those modifications to ensure consistency between the respective City Plan and Local Plan Policy is attached.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 974

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Brighton & Hove City Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHED SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO PLAN.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 840

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Cemex UK Properties Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Deloitte Real Estate

Revised Draft Policy 8: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area, identifies the harbour as a broad location for change and states that 'the Council will work closely with existing site owners and businesses to identify their needs, support their future aspirations and facilitate relocations to suitable sites either within the consolidated harbour or elsewhere in the local area'. CEMEX supports the Council working with existing site owners and businesses to identify their needs and believes that this accords with NPPF Paragraph 21, bullet point 3. CEMEX does not support the relocation of existing business uses within the area (unless the relocation is explicitly requested by the business in question) and believes that in relation to the CEMEX site, this policy is not compliant with NPPF Paragraph 143, bullet point 4. Location is a critical factor in the siting of a ready-mixed concrete plant, since high transportation costs and the nature of the product dictate that a site can only serve a relatively small radial area. If CEMEX were to relocate to the south quay, the area that could be served from such a site would be drastically reduced since it is not well connected to Southwick, Fishersgate, Portslade and Shoreham, meaning local demand for this key product in development and urban regeneration projects would not be met. CEMEX owns its site freehold and intends to remain in its current location for the foreseeable future, as to do otherwise would be against its operational interests and those of its customers. This means that the existing site is sustainable and forcing the re-location of the plant and wharf would be contrary to Paragraph 142 of the NPPF, which states that 'minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life. It is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. Relocating the existing CEMEX site would reduce the supply of concrete in Sussex and across the South East and would therefore not be compliant with NPPF Paragraph 142.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 978

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Slipways Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I visited the exhibition in Southwick where I looked at the overview and some of the detailed information. Clearly, a considerable amount of time and care had gone into gathering and presenting the information. Whilst I glanced at most of the information I concentrated on the Shoreham Harbour issues.

I also carried out a simple word analysis of the four documents online:

Econom (as in economist, economy etc) had 87 references which is excellent.

Touris (as is tourist, tourism etc) had 10 references which is disappointing.

Slipway (and variants) only had three references.

The River Adur is a major plus for Adur and developments around the harbour should make best use of this asset. Improving access to the water will not only provide facilities for local river users but will encourage people from the wider area to visit the town. They will not only be those with a boat but people who like seeing water based activities. Visitors to the town will spend money and thus boost the local economy. Littlehampton has made the area around Arun far more attractive which in turn has encouraged people to go there to spend money. Also towns in the west country survive by making the water appealing both to boat users and general tourists.

More generally, steps will need to be taken to ensure that the plan isn't pushed aside purely for commercial reasons (as happened with the Ropetackle development). Also, more effort needs to be put into easing the traffic issues.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 826

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation UK Independence Party

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

LATE REP

Shoreham Harbour

We note from The Plan that it is becoming difficult to find an economic case for the large scale development of the west arm of Shoreham Harbour. Industrial and commercial development must therefore be more modest than previously envisaged.

We would commend a policy of making provision for about 1,000 dwellings with an emphasis on lower cost, 'social housing'. The new houses should be built to match the housing needs of Adur.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 08: Shoreham Harbour Regeneration Area

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We suggest that given the broad proposal of this policy and high level of housing suggested in the Shoreham Harbour area, that a suite of ecological enhancements are considered within the policy wording. As well as seeking on site biodiversity gains inline with section 109 of the NPPF, we feel the policy must consider off site biodiversity gains. The policy highlights the priority to enhance connections between Shoreham town centre and Shoreham beach. As a result there should be recognition of the potential increase in pressure on sites such as Wide Water Lagoon LNR and Shoreham Beach LNR, therefore this policy should seek to highlight the importance of securing 106/CIL payments for the long term management and monitoring of these sites particular given the presence of the highly sensitive vegetated shingle priority habitat.

We would also encourage the polices over arching view to take into consideration the importance of incorporating green infrastructure through all aspects of this regeneration area.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 09: Lancing**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 09: Lancing

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We welcome the suggestions of environmental improvements in the policy, but are concerned that the wording is too vague and does not define a mechanism that will be used to deliver this. Given the visionary form of the policy, we suggest wording could be used to state that environmental gains and improved cycle and pedestrian links will be delivered through the development of the green infrastructure strategy for the district, funding for which will be secured through 106/CIL payments. This would make this a more robust policy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 09: Lancing

Reference No. 912

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Dear Sir

I am writing to state my objection to the proposed building works on Lancing gap. My reasons for objecting are as follows :

- 1) The area for the proposed development is a known flood plain, myself and my neighbours suffered severe flooding in December 2012, and this will only be worsened by building on this land.
- 2) The increase in population, in regards to schools, increased demand on doctors surgeries, employment etc is not something Lancing is equipped to deal with.
- 3) The amount of traffic already using the A27 causes daily traffic jams, the increase of cars ( at least another 600 cars daily) can only cause more delays and extra pollution.
- 4) The impact on the wildlife will be catastrophic, we have foxes, badgers, deer roaming on this green land, their habitat will be destroyed ( I find it very confusing how the clearance of ditches had to be postponed because badgers were nesting but it is acceptable to completely destroy their enviroment !!)

Please note my objections

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 09: Lancing

Reference No. 75

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Lancing - The idea seem reasonable, however, The Council taxes on the shops seem to prevent local shops to continue within them trying to charge bigger prices than the near by super/hyper markets. Who also can give parking, fuel. Also reduce council tax on shops within the Lancing shopping area. Any chance of a weekly market in Queen Parade and car park - similar to the Europeans? What has happened about the building on the Beech Green? - I understand that it is blowing away piece by piece. Why was the proposals approx. 2 years ago from a Young Consortium not supported?

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Para 3.11-3.14**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Para 3.11-3.14

Reference No. 951

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The current road systems cannot support any further development. Any development in the Northern part of the West Sompting proposal will force traffic either onto the A27 via Dankton Lane (one of the 3 oldest roads in Sompting) or West Street through Sompting village going West or via Busticle Lane going East (already a very busy route with new development on the corner with West Street and for access to the industrial estate).

Drainage is already an issue and no further development abutting the A27 should take place until this has been resolved. Sompting has been built on soggy marshland which was originally the banks and flood plain of the Broadwater river (diverted over the years) all of this land should be kept as a strategic gap between Sompting and Broadwater.

Consultation notices should have been delivered to all residents in the area and this has not happened.

There are no decent shops, inadequate Health and Educational facilities in the area to support the number of new homes proposed and Shoreham to Worthing will be morphed into one with each area losing its own identity.

Development of Brownfield sites must be preferable to any further development on green areas particularly as they are adjacent to the South Downs National Park.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Para 3.13**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Para 3.13

Reference No. 951

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Funding awarded from the lottery is to improve Sompting and make it a better place for the people currently living there. The addition of extra housing with no infrastructure and added congestion will undermine this and in fact make Sompting a worse place to live.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Para 3.9**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Para 3.9

Reference No. 25

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

I concur with the need for further discussions with West Sussex on West Street traffic. More traffic calming measures in West Street to deter the morning and evening "rat run" are required, making the road a 20mph limit throughout with cameras, priority 'elbows' (as through Ditchling) and the blocking off of Church Lane as a slip road from A27. The problem first arose when West Sussex/Worthing agreed to two sets of traffic lights within 100 metres of each other for Lyons Farm Estate. Sorting that out may well remove the problem but meanwhile the other deterrents to those using West St as a quicker route are necessary.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Vehicles use West Street to avoid congestion on the A27. NMUs also use West Street, including equestrians, and improvement plans should take this into consideration.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting Reference No. 920

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Until there is a sustainable infrastructure in place then in my opinion no more new homes should be built. The A27 and West Street in Sompting as well as the A259 to the south is already gridlocked in rush hour. This problem exists between Shoreham and Chichester and has worsened over the 50 years that I have lived in the area. Going east through the Southwick tunnel the road is so much better all the way to Eastbourne. It is a delight to travel east from Sompting after traversing through the tunnel but to go west is a nightmare. I think that the solution should be a by pass north of the downs all the way long the Sussex coast. It is not good putting in silly traffic calming measures. This just makes drivers frustrated and angry at an already gridlocked road.

My other objection to more homes is that there will be more people needed schools, hospitals and doctors. Yes the town centre of Lancing is run down and sad. For me living in Sompting it is too far to walk and impossible to park in Lancing or Worthing so I take the bus to Worthing. This does not encourage visitors to either towns. Please, first, improve the infrastructure and make the villages and towns more accessible and then hopefully more businesses will grow and then more homes should follow.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting Reference No. 775

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Although I understand more housing development is required in the area, OVER development will bring more problems that it is solving.

POLICY 10 page 73. 3.10.

Parts of Peveral Ward in Sompting...

2nd most deprived area in the county in terms of education, skills and training. Unless more school places, health centres and support centres are provided, Sompting will remain a deprived area.

There will definitely be an impact on local and main roads in an already congested area.

The infrastructure will need to be well planned and organised to incorporate this number of homes into our small village and surrounding areas.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Big Local

The 'Big Local' is briefly mentioned in the Plan. We would wish to emphasise that this initiative is wholly independent of any aspect of government and no reliance can be placed on its work for achieving specific objectives set in The Plan. Our district councillors are well aware (and supportive) of our view that there should be no diminution of funding to Sompting arising from what Big Local may or may not do.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 745

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Objecting and commenting on the improvements to reduce traffic through West Street, Sompting.

If traffic is reduced through West Street, traffic would have to come down Busticle Lane and as it is already over capacity, how would that solve the problem? With new housing schemes and pre-existing projects already in place, the road down from Busticle Lane into Western Road North would become gridlocked. Have you seen how the 'village idiots' park already, come and see for yourselves and have a laugh!

With the Ball Tree Surgery and shops (did you know that staff are not allowed to park in their own car park) traffic is already horrendous. Parking in and around the area is very congested. Parking either side of the road would cause an obstruction, which is against the law.

Stupid ideas like this only succeeds in creating disharmony for everyone.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As with all policies for places we are keen to see that green infrastructure is a considered driver in the policy, given its ability to delivery multifunctional benefits. The location of Sompting village within the local green gap and the suggested development in West Sompting means that a commitment to the delivery of green infrastructure and biodiversity gains in this area should be enshrined in policy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Localism and Local Democracy

We object to the requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan should be written around Adur's Plan. Due consideration must be given to the already stated views of the people of Sompting as provided in the 'State of the Parish Report'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 918

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Summit Planning Associates

We object to Draft Policy 10: Sompting. In its current draft form Policy 10 states that Sompting village will not be expanded due to its linear character and countryside location within the Local Green Gap.

Given the wider strategic housing supply problem being faced by the District Council (as outlined in draft policies 3 and 4), we would argue that the current wording of Draft Policy 10 is unduly restrictive and inconsistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires local plans to meet objectively assessed needs and have sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.

It is recognised that historically, Planning Inspectors have acknowledged the District's physical constraints when agreeing housing targets and have afforded a significant amount of weight to this consideration. Consequently, this has resulted in a persistent under delivery of housing.

Given the above, the current draft policy framework being pushed forward by the Local Planning Authority seems to rest on the assumption that it can continue with this historic approach, in acknowledgement that it will continue to under deliver on its objectively assessed housing need. This approach is fundamentally inconsistent with up-to-date national planning guidance in the form of the NPPF, which has been introduced since the last time that the Local Planning Authority revised its local policy framework.

The NPPF has tightened responsibility on local Planning Authorities to fully meet their objectively assessed market and affordable housing needs and to demonstrate on an annual basis, a deliverable supply of sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against that objectively assessed need and to have sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.

Sompting village has some potential for infill development, which would compromise neither its existing character nor countryside location. Being located outside of the Built Up Area Boundary, it is recognised that any such development would need to be at a level and density appropriate to its setting.

As currently worded, draft policy 10 serves to unduly restrict further, the ability of the LPA to maximise its efforts of delivering its objectively assessed housing need and inhibits its ability to adapt to rapid change, should this be required.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 919

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Until there is a sustainable infrastructure in place then in my opinion no more new homes should be built. The A27 and West Street in Sompting as well as the A259 to the south is already gridlocked in rush hour. This problem exists between Shoreham and Chichester and has worsened over the 50 years that I have lived in the area. Going east through the Southwick tunnel the road is so much better all the way to Eastbourne. It is a delight to travel east from Sompting after traversing through the tunnel but to go west is a nightmare. I think that the solution should be a by pass north of the downs all the way long the Sussex coast. It is not good putting in silly traffic calming measures. This just makes drivers frustrated and angry at an already gridlocked road.

My other objection to more homes is that there will be more people needed schools, hospitals and doctors. Yes the town centre of Lancing is run down and sad. For me living in Sompting it is too far to walk and impossible to park in Lancing or Worthing so I take the bus to Worthing. This does not encourage visitors to either towns. Please, first, improve the infrastructure and make the villages and towns more accessible and then hopefully more businesses will grow and then more homes should follow.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 10: Sompting

Reference No. 515

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Please ensure more lighting.

More buses and shelters with a better service needed.

Decrease the speed limits.

More shops are also needed in Sompting. Definitely more houses needed so that young families can have a garden and room to move.

There are too many flats which are far too small and expensive, which appear to be aimed at the elderly.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Para 3.16**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Para 3.16

Reference No. 969

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Northbrook College

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The opportunities afforded by the retail and business development in Shoreham could also include further incubation units for local start up supported by educational partners. This could capitalise on the proximity to Ropetackle and the 'Arts' culture of Shoreham Beach, perhaps picking up some of the success Brighton has had in promoting a digital creative sector.

Overall, there is a need to look at place and infrastructure in terms of skills and education as well as the promotion of employment and business/social enterprise opportunities as well as in terms of homes, green spaces and roads, important though these are.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 35

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The Civic Centre car park needs to be retained as a car park and Civic Centre site used for a hotel if possible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 887

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The Co-operative Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Barton Willmore LLP

## BACKGROUND

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (“the Co-op”) and have been instructed to submit representations to the consultation on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013. This follows the submission of representations to the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan in October 2012.
2. The Co-op is an important stakeholder in Adur District, operating Town Centre ‘Co-operative Food’ stores in Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Lancing. These stores all perform important anchor roles for their respective Town Centres, generating trade, footfall and associated spin-off benefits for other retailers, in turn providing a valuable contribution to Town Centre vitality and viability.
3. Against this background, we set out our comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013 and its performance against the soundness tests contained at NPPF paragraph 182.

## Part 3 – Policies for Places

### Policy 11 – Shoreham-by-Sea

Whilst the Co-op generally supports the aims of the Policy in respect of new retail development, it objects to the wording in the 3rd paragraph.

In particular, the Policy seeks to direct new retail floorspace to the Town Centre. It should be noted that

21612/A3/AI 2 6th November 2013 the Town Centre in retail policy terms comprises the Primary Shopping Area. Seeking to direct retail development to the Town Centre could be interpreted as lending support for retail schemes outside the Primary Shopping Area. This would not be consistent with the NPPF or Policy 27 of the Plan.

It is therefore recommended that the reference to the “Town Centre” in respect of retail development should be replaced with “Primary Shopping Area”, to ensure soundness and for the avoidance of doubt.

The Co-op is also concerned that the supporting text (paragraph 3.16) refers to the Adur Retail Study Update 2009, which forms part of the evidence base and has informed the preparation of the Plan. As set out in our previous representations to the 2012 Consultation, this Study is out-of-date, being based on a household shopping survey undertaken in March 2009.

It is understood that a new version of the Study is being prepared and will be published in the near future. It is important that the findings of the new Study are taken into account in future consultation versions of the Plan in order that it is based on up-to-date evidence.

### Recommended Changes To The Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013

For the reasons set out above, the Co-op generally supports the Revised Draft Local Plan in its current form. However, the Co-op has some concerns with the detailed wording of Policies and recommends the following changes in order to make the Plan sound:

- Amend Draft Policy 11 in order that it directs retail development to the Primary Shopping Area of the Shoreham Town Centre in the first instance, for consistency with the NPPF and Policy 27 of the Plan.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The Civic Centre and Ropetackle North sites identified in this policy are located within Flood Zone 3. With regard to Ropetackle North there is a current application under consideration which includes flood defences. The fourth paragraph on page 79 makes reference to development adjacent to the river and flood defence works. We recommend specific reference is made here to the implications of this for Ropetackle North.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 10

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Suggest free electric bus around area. Nottingham has this with the result of: 1. Reduced pollution; 2. less congestion as stops are limited (e.g. main shopping areas, station etc.); and 3: fuel efficiency.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 10

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Better access needed for beach area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

There is no mention of the 'Downs Link' a strategically important multi-use route giving safe access to the wider countryside and the SDNP.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

3.18: Please add 'More vulnerable development types should be directed away from areas at highest flood risk and a flood risk assessment should be undertaken that demonstrates that the development will be safe for its lifetime, the residual risks of flooding to people and property (including the likely effects of climate change) are acceptable and can be satisfactorily managed'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

3.17: Marlipins is listed grade II\* but is also a scheduled ancient monument. This is recognised on the map 13 'Shoreham Character Area map', but is not necessarily clear from the text. The dual status is a historic legacy of the days before listing came in when scheduling was the only means of designating historic buildings which were in use / in occupation.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised draft policies 11 & 12: Reference should be made to the findings of the Shoreham Town Centre Transport Study for transport improvements.

The Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) on A270 / Kingston Lane junction should also be referenced in these policies.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 11: Please remove 'car parking strategy' and replace with 'appropriate parking controls'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Page 19 of the revised plan clearly displays which policies deliver which objectives. The table indicates that policy 11 looks to deliver many objectives including object O6. Objective 6 looks at delivery through a green infrastructure strategy. The Sussex Wildlife Trust are concerned that the policy as it stands does not make reference to the enhancement of multifunctional green spaces in Shoreham by Sea by the delivery of aspirations set out in the proposed green infrastructure strategy. Inclusion of this within the policy would offer a clear vision for the future green infrastructure delivery of this area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 916

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Hargreaves Management Limited

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Representations from Hargreaves Management Limited

As significant landowners within the Adur area and particularly, Shoreham, Hargreaves have considered the revised draft Local Plan and have the following comments / observations.

Revised Draft Policy 11

Having regard to the importance placed on the Dolphin Road Business Park which is to be encouraged, improvements should be made to the junction of Eastern Avenue and Dolphin Road which is presently constrained by a single exit to Dolphin Road onto Eastern Avenue, resulting in congestion caused by vehicles seeking to turn right (north) up Eastern Avenue conflicting with vehicles travelling south across the railway. Improvements should be made to this junction to ensure that the area remains suitable for modern businesses.

Shoreham Cement Works

The revised draft Local Plan remains silent over this site which sites partially within the Borough. Whilst the site sits within the South Downs National Park and for which the planning authority is therefore the South Downs National Park, the site has significant opportunities for the benefit of the coastal region and a specific policy should be included within the draft Local Plan in this regard.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 831

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Affinity Commercial LLP

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Howard Sharp & Partners LLP

Affinity Commercial LLP is asset managing site for Riverside Walk Developments (Sussex) Ltd (in administration) and 12/18 Old Shoreham Road Developments (Sussex) Ltd (in administration).

The identification of Ropetackle North as a site for mixed use development to include housing and employment is supported. The current planning application AWDM/0935/13 puts forward a mix of uses that accords with the draft policy and will contribute to the vitality of the town.

The improvement of pedestrian/cycle access to and along the River, including opportunities through new development, is supported. The opening up a new public route to the riverside from Old Shoreham Road and the provision of a high quality riverside pedestrian/cycle route is a key component of the current planning application.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 11: Shoreham-By-Sea

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

“It is vital that the town’s heritage assets are protected whilst ensuring they are not undermined by new development.”

In general we support this policy but members feel that the plan should be more robust to enable it to resist planning appeals. Members have made suggestions listed below.

- To avoid developments having an adverse impact on St Mary De Haura Church it may be advisable to specify a maximum height for buildings within a specified distance of the tower.
- Pond Road Car Park – We have concerns that the amount of public spaces in this convenient town centre car park will be significantly reduced due to spaces required by the new Civic (and possibly future Police) presence in the Community Centre. Members have suggested therefore that the Civic Centre Staff car park be not sold off for the time being and used as a public car park. There is even more reason to do this if the Police Station is redeveloped as retail. It will still be an asset that could be sold off in the future.
- Any car parking strategy should attract shoppers to the town centre shops with an appealing package, for instance 2 hours free parking on-street (possibly by parking disk) plus at the retained Civic Centre Staff Car Park. Cars should not be seen as cash cows, generating money for the Council through charges & fines as happened in Worthing. Neighbouring towns (e.g. Steyning) currently have better specialist shops with generous free and disc parking, thereby attracting shoppers away from Shoreham town.
- We are told that shoppers will be encouraged to park at the Frosts/Minelco site (Morrisons) and walk into the town centre. To facilitate this members have suggested that some of Section 106 monies be used to build a contemporary footbridge over the A259. This will
  - Create a safer and more stylish pedestrian route to the town centre & station
  - Reduce air pollution because traffic will not have to keep stopping at pedestrian lights
  - Create an attractive addition to the streetscape: ‘Welcome to Shoreham’ and a potential site for events banners.
- Shoreham is an attractive town for pedestrians but there are some weak spots that need addressing. Paramount among these is un-necessary waits at Buckingham Road level crossing when there is an existing Subway. “New and improved foot and cycle routes” mentioned should therefore include, in conjunction with Network Rail, re-opening the pedestrian subway under the crossing; this would also improve safety and station access. The NPPF paragraph 75 states that “Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails”.
- Dolphin Road Industrial Estate. Members have suggested making Dolphin Road a through route to Kingston Lane. This improves access for vehicles and could well reduce congestion at the Eastern Avenue level crossing (although a left-turning lane might be required here). Importantly however it takes traffic off part the over-congested A259.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 12: Southwick and Fishersgate**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 12: Southwick and Fishersgate

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The Sussex Wildlife Trust is disappointed to see this policy consider a well use allotment site proposed for potential development. Section 3.39 of the plan already highlights the deprivation in the Eastbrook ward and we suggest the further erosion of a community facility and biodiversity resource would do little to reverse this situation. There is no mention of relocation of the existing allotment facilities. It will also be important for the council to consider how the development of this site fits within the districts green infrastructure strategy and biodiversity policies.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 12: Southwick and Fishersgate

Reference No. 884

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Carats Café Bar

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As the owner of Carats Café Bar, with a leaseholder interest at both the beach café and one of the beach huts, it would probably come as no great surprise that my staff and I hold Southwick Beach in great esteem. That might be best reflected in the fact that a visual representation of Southwick Beach can be found at the centre of our branding for the café.

Whilst we have no legal responsibility for the beach, nor for the promenade, public toilets or pay and display car park, we would like to think that we do our level best to be both a good neighbour and partner with the existing interests that surround us at Southwick Beach, as well as running our business in a way that we feel complements the location and best serves our loyal customer base too.

As a stakeholder at this location, we certainly see scope for a variety of upgrades and additions that would be beneficial for Southwick Beach and would enhance the surrounding area. If we were to simply use our core customer groups at the café as an indicator for the potential areas of additional need, then it seems obvious that scope exists to solicit input from the existing users of Southwick Beach, to help underpin what more could be done to enhance the area and improve things for them.

To that end, we are happy to play an active role in discussions and any further consultations. By working together, with both end users and stakeholders alike, I believe that we have the opportunity to make Southwick Beach more than just a name on a map and something that we can feel proud to be associated with for many years to come.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 12: Southwick and Fishersgate

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised draft policies 11 & 12: Reference should be made to the findings of the Shoreham Town Centre Transport Study for transport improvements.

The Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) on A270 / Kingston Lane junction should also be referenced in these policies.

### Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Para 3.47 - The commitment to looking for opportunities to enhance green infrastructure in developments is welcome, and this should include improving the proW network by providing links between routes. However, improving access should also include equestrians, where appropriate.

Para 3.48 - Any improvements to public access for 'quiet informal recreation' should be multi-use and include equestrians, where appropriate. Multi-use PRoW provide 'green corridors', contribute to active, healthy lifestyles, benefit the economy, tourism, wildlife and biodiversity. Why no mention of the Downs Link which ticks all these boxes?

Any improvement to access across the A27 should include equestrians.

Para 3.52 - When the Council prepared this Design Bulletin 'Development involving Horses in the Countryside' who was consulted? The British Horse Society should have been and would have been happy to contribute its expertise.

Generally supported - but why are equestrians not included, suggest wording 'Improvements to green infrastructure, including enhanced pedestrian, cycle and equestrian (where appropriate) links, and better access for those with mobility difficulties will be supported.'

Strongly support second paragraph, especially in relation to increased number of vehicles on quiet rural roads and country lanes

Support commitment to protecting and respecting the countryside.

Improving access to the SDNP should include access for equestrians.

Support policy for 'proposals for equestrian development', as BHS agrees development should be of high quality and appropriate to its location and the environment.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The Sussex Wildlife Trust welcomes an overarching policy that looks at the importance of the countryside. This policy would be strengthened by using wording to consider the biodiversity value of any sites being considered for development in the countryside. This would help it to conform to paragraph 118 of the NPPF, which states that: "Planning permission should be refused for any developments resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats..."

This policy fails to demonstrate a strong recognition of protected and priority species and habitats that may be impacted by development in the countryside. We suggest that the policy includes wording to take account of potential issues arising from new development or alterations to buildings that may affect protected habitats and or species; for example bats and or bat flight lines. "Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged..." (NPPF, Para 113).

This policy also extends to cover equestrian interests. While the wording considers the impact of development on the open character of the landscape it fails to address the impact on the function of the landscape by equestrian development. The Sussex Wildlife Trust feels this must be incorporated in to the policy with further wording to ensure there are no adverse impacts on biodiversity from equestrian development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 13: This policy states that "The appropriate change of use or conversion of existing buildings in the countryside will be permitted providing that ....". Biodiversity, notably bats (European Protected Species) and Barn Owls (Schedule 1 of Wildlife & Countryside Act, 1981), should also be mentioned as an issue which may need to be addressed. Old barns, in particular in the countryside can provide important roosting and breeding sites for bats and barn owls.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority strongly supports the references in Policy 13 stating that the setting of the National Park must be respected and the National Park Authority will look to work with the district council and developers to ensure that this important policy is successfully implemented.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 942

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation South Downs Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Countryside and Coast:

Para 3.45 commits the authority to work with the national park authority to improve access to the park where appropriate and in relation to Shoreham cement works: this is welcomed.

Para 3.46 refers to open areas of countryside including "local green gaps" and the great importance of protecting and enhancing them: this will compliment the work of the national park authority and partners, and is welcomed.

Para 3.47 refers to the importance of minimising the landscape impact of any new development in the countryside and protecting important views: this is welcomed, and should include any impact on the national park.

Para 3.48 refers to the importance of providing for quiet informal recreation within Adur's countryside and the need for improved pedestrian and cycle access across the A27: this would complement the work of the national park authority and its partners and is welcomed.

Revised Draft Policy 13 enshrines the above commitments in policy form, specifically refers to respect for the setting of the national park and the need to improve access to it, and is welcomed.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Support improvements to green infrastructure, including enhanced pedestrian and cycle links, and better access for those with mobility difficulties, but should include equestrians (where appropriate).

Support protection of Local Green Gaps outside of the strategic sites, and other areas of countryside, but would like to see commitment to enhancement of the PRow network (especially multi-use). The Downs Link multi-user route passes through Adur so why is it not mentioned? It is an important, strategic multi-use route giving safe access to the South Downs Way and the SDNP to the north from the heart of Shoreham.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Adur's Countryside and Coast

Reference No. 975

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation New Monks Farm Development Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Enplan UK Ltd

RD Policy 13 Adur's Countryside and Coast

We object to the reference within this policy to Local Green Gaps. These policies are no longer supported within the National Planning Policy Framework and there is confusion as to the function of Local Green Gaps within the draft Local Plan. They appear to be designated as countryside/landscape areas when they are in reality a form of policy to prevent towns coalescing (akin to metropolitan green belt policies). However, they are outdated and are not relevant. It is confusing to add them into a wider policy on the countryside and we therefore object. This policy should be well thought through and in accordance with government policy. As it stands it seeks to cover too many different issues and the draft Local Plan even permits significant new development within the Local Green Gap - such as that at the Airport. We also object to all other references to Local Green Gaps in the Plan (see below).

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Para 3.44**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Para 3.44

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references in para.3.44 to the South Downs National Park and the setting out of the National Parks' two statutory purposes.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Para 3.45**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Para 3.45

Reference No. 877

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation South Downs National Park Authority

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The South Downs National Park Authority welcomes the references to the district council working with the National Park Authority to improve access to the National Park, where approach, and also in relation to Shoreham Cement Works, which lies wholly within the National Park.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 13: Para 3.45

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

3.45: Support to protect and enhance The Downs Link, a bridleway linking Shoreham with Guildford, and a major artery for recreational access into the South Downs National Park, would be welcomed. Access around the former Shoreham Cement Works can particularly be enhanced, not just with physical works but also by securing a formal public access right.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 14: Quality of the Built Environment and Pu**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 14: Quality of the Built Environment and Pu

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support this policy. It appears to be general good practice for any town.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 14: Quality of the Built Environment and Pu

Reference No. 1061

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Liberal Democrats

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I am concerned with the statements in paragraph 4.6 (pages 94-95) that, in the future, the Council may consider applications to build houses in residential gardens. The wording of this paragraph is so loose that it could be interpreted as encouraging residential garden development. Such development is often very unsatisfactory as it leads to an intensification of development, removes open space, and frequently has a bad effect on neighbouring properties. I notice that the suggestions in paragraph 4.6 do not seem to have been incorporated into Revised Draft Policy 14 and I would urge you to include a policy statement making it clear that house building in residential gardens will only be approved where the factors you mention in paragraph 4.6 have been stringently applied and where there are no reasonable objections from neighbours.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 14: Quality of the Built Environment and Pu

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The inclusion of natural features and biodiversity within this policy is welcome as it demonstrates the potential contributions the built environment can offer to biodiversity. We note the recognition of gardens in section 4.6 but would like the policy to include wording to resist the inappropriate development of gardens as suggested in the NPPF:

'Local authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.' NPPF Section 53

The policies wording relating to the respect of natural features should seek to clarify that 'positive contribution to biodiversity' should mean a net gain as per section 109 of the NPPF. 'The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: Minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.' "Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged" NPPF paragraph 118.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 15: Para 4.10**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 15: Para 4.10

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

4.10: Please consider a reference to Marlipins as a significant designated asset in conjunction with Shoreham Fort and the dome trainer at the airport.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 15: Para 4.11**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 15: Para 4.11

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

4.11 (footnote 2): EUS reports can be accessed through the West Sussex County Council website.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 15: Para 4.12**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 15: Para 4.12

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

4.12: 'The protection of sites of archaeological interest is also covered by legislation' – please consider use of the term 'designated heritage asset' as in the NPPF.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 16: The Historic Environment**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 16: The Historic Environment

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 16: Under 'Archaeological Features', please refer to the NPPF approach to assessment and evaluation set out in section 12, paragraph 128.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 17: Para 4.16**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 17: Para 4.16

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

4.16: The County Council should be invited to comment on the emerging Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 17: The Energy Hierarchy**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 17: The Energy Hierarchy

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 17: For the last point (deviation from this hierarchy...), consideration should be given to strengthening the wording to ensure compliance with the hierarchy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 17: The Energy Hierarchy

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The Sussex Wildlife Trust welcomes a policy that will take steps to ensure development proposals contribute to the UK Governments legally binding commitments to reduce carbon emissions enshrined in the Climate Change Act 2008. Climate change is the most serious threat facing biodiversity and there fore we would encourage this proposal to further identify micro generation as a requirement for each development.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 18: Sustainable Design**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 18: Sustainable Design

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We are pleased to see the requirement for residential development to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 as a minimum and that specific reference is made within the Policy to water efficiencies in relation all new development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 18: Sustainable Design

Reference No. 839

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Home Builders Federation Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 18 – Sustainable Design

We note the requirement for development to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 as a minimum. The Council will need to justify this local policy requirement by undertaking a local plan viability assessment to demonstrate that this is standard viable in combination with other policies and therefore does not jeopardise the delivery of the plan.

Furthermore, the policy is unclear in its specification that Code 4 should be achieved as a minimum. It is unclear how developers will be expected to respond to this policy. There appears to be the expectation that applicants will need to demonstrate why higher levels of the Code cannot be achieved. This is contrary to the thrust of national policy. National policy now expects the local authority to justify its policies and demonstrate viability, not the other way around. The onus is on the Council to demonstrate viability in the majority of cases.

In view of the Government's intentions to rationalise local standards, and because new housing will need to meet Zero Carbon Homes standards in any case from 2016 onwards, we recommend that this policy is deleted.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 18: Sustainable Design

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We encourage the council's policy on this. We also feel that, due to the high demand for houses in our area we should be able to insist on high standards of sustainable design and ADC should encourage developers to a higher level where possible. Build costs may be higher but they would be cheaper to live in.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 18: Sustainable Design

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 18: It would be useful if 'energy efficient fittings and appliances' was clarified further. What exactly is meant by energy efficient?

There is no mention of waste as a resource, and looking to use such materials in buildings. In this policy, there is also no mention of reducing the waste associated with development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 18: Sustainable Design

Reference No. 982

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sompting Parish Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Technological developments in recent years have reduced energy usage considerably. Modern materials are durable. The high cost of energy has already forced people to adopt the best possible energy-saving measures. We anticipate that national standards in construction and energy usage already take account of the trade-off between the capital cost of insulation and lifetime costs of ownership. There is probably little justification in trying to 'guild the lily,' by insisting on higher than national standards for Sompting. Moreover, more-demanding criteria may bring with them costs that make 'affordable housing' less affordable.

In the area of water conservation, Sompting Parish Council have taken the initiative by responding to Southern Water's recent request for comments on their water supply philosophy document. We have asked for current water supply arrangements for Sompting. When this data become available (together with an assessment of future water demand), Sompting Parish Council will comment on any options available for increasing water supply. We do note from the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan that there are at present no issues expected with respect to water supply and waste water.

We note that some of the properties shortly to be built in Busticle Lane are to have 100% water recycling. This should not be imposed on new buildings at this time.

Moreover, we note that solar panels are only made economically viable by imposing a significant levy on other electricity bill payers. We believe this to be an unfair burden on society when balanced against the claimed benefits with respect to 'Climate Change.' 'Sustainable Energy' policies have already driven up energy bills to unsustainable levels.

4.24 As detailed in Revised Draft Policy 17, the approach to reducing building related CO2 emissions should follow the energy hierarchy of demand reduction first, efficient energy supply next, followed by renewable energy generation. With respect to efficient energy supply, decentralised energy systems and networks can provide an extremely cost effective approach to minimising CO2 emissions especially where networks can be expanded to accommodate new and existing developments over time. Such networks could include, for example, specifically designed Combined Heat and Power systems (CHP) linked to district heating networks or utilising existing waste heat from industrial uses/ existing power stations through a district heating network. These types of systems represent a particularly efficient use of energy and should be considered by developers in new proposals.

District heating schemes have been extensively used in former Soviet Republics. They are ugly (miles of above-ground pipes) and it is difficult to control the combined requirements of innumerable individual customers.

Modern, efficient domestic condensing boilers already compete favourably against District Heating schemes. Domestic boilers require limited household space. District Heating Plant requires special sites. Domestic boilers do not.

Combined heat and power schemes always suffer from competing and irreconcilable demands for either heat or power; something has to give. Moreover, larger power generation units are always more efficient than smaller ones. Therefore, any improvements in power delivery are more than offset by using less efficient generation plant.

We doubt that this solution is applicable to Sompting.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 19: Decentralised Energy and Stand-alone En**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 19: Decentralised Energy and Stand-alone En      Reference No. 839  
Relates To Map     Relates To Paragraph     Relates to Policy       Organisation Home Builders Federation Ltd  
Comments                      Support     Object     Comment       Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 19 - Decentralised Energy and Stand-alone Energy Schemes

This policy is contrary to the direction of Government Policy.

We refer to the recently published DCLG consultation document Next steps to zero carbon homes – Allowable Solutions published in August 2013. This sets out the Government’s thinking on the definition of Allowable Solutions and how this will be discharged. The policy as written requires that Allowable Solutions are agreed by East Hampshire Council. This is contrary to the direction of Government thinking on this question as set out in the recently published Government consultation document we have referred to above. The Government proposes that house builders will have a choice of four routes to deliver the remaining carbon abatement above the onsite minimum level required by the Building Regulations from 2016 (see chapter 6). One option includes contracting with a private sector party or local authority for them to deliver carbon abatement measures, but developers cannot be compelled down this route. Developers may be allowed to deliver Allowable Solutions through a combination of the four options. How Allowable Solutions are delivered is a matter for the developer to decide, not the Council. The policy therefore, is not compliant with the direction of Government thinking and should be deleted. This is not a planning matter.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 20: Housing Mix and Quality**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 20: Housing Mix and Quality      Reference No. 1169  
Relates To Map     Relates To Paragraph     Relates to Policy       Organisation Adur & Worthing Business Partnership  
Comments                      Support     Object     Comment       Agent's Organisation

The Adur Local Plan should provide for a good mix of housing, particularly as an objective of the AWBP is to attract high value jobs within the area, so reducing the degree of commuting out of the area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 20: Housing Mix and Quality

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support this policy as it seems appropriate for the desirable make-up of the town and area.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 20: Housing Mix and Quality  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy   
Comments Support  Object  Comment

Reference No. 839  
Organisation Home Builders Federation Ltd  
Agent's Organisation

#### Revised Draft Policy 20 – Housing Mix and Quality

It is not appropriate for the Council to specify the bedroom size of new dwellings. Because the Council is not meeting its full housing need (the objective need is for at least 4,300 dwellings but the plan provides for only 2,947 at best and there is no mechanism for this unmet need to be picked-up by someone else) the evidence in the SHMA of the type and tenure of homes needed becomes increasingly irrelevant. Specifying that the majority of new supply should take the form of 2-3 bedroom family homes would only be realistic if the Council was providing for the entirety of its needs (i.e. at least 4,300 homes). Because the Council isn't, it is therefore inevitable that the cost of housing in the district will outpace local incomes over the plan period. Lower-income households will be forced to accommodate themselves in the best way they can. This means that overcrowding (or to put a moralistic gloss upon this: the return to the nuclear family) will become more commonplace. There may be a need for three-bed family sized homes but as local people are unlikely to be able to afford them. Therefore if the Council specifies that the majority of the supply should take the form of 2-3 bed homes, and houses instead of flats in the town centres, this will prove injurious to local households and those in need of affordable housing. One and two bedroom flats would be cheaper. The family sized houses will be purchased and occupied by smaller, more affluent households. Poorer people will live in larger household sizes in over-crowded conditions in flats. This is the reality.

Specifying the size of dwellings therefore becomes increasingly irrelevant in the face of the strategic scale of the undersupply that is brewing along the Sussex South Coast. It is unlikely that the Council's attempt to ameliorate the problems that are caused by undersupply will be resolved by attempting to direct the type of dwellings built. Its endeavours are likely to make the problem worse.

We note that the policy encourages all homes to be built to the Lifetime Homes standard. The Council will need to assess the cost of doing so in a Local Plan Viability Assessment. Unless this is viable when assessed in combination with other local plan policy objectives (30% affordable housing, Code 4, S106 etc) then the Council cannot assume that it will be feasible to secure this standard. The Council will need to be sure that something is feasible if it wishes to encourage something.

We note the Council's intention to set Internal and External Space Standards for private sector housing through an SPD. This approach is contrary to the thrust of national planning policy. The NPPF states that SPDs should not be used to introduce new local policy especially when this will add to the cost of development. The Council is required by the NPPF to assess the cost of local plan policy requirement through a viability assessment. This is an important discipline, not only to ensure that delivery of the plan is not derailed by unrealistic demands, but also as a way of engaging with residents and deciding planning priorities.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 21: Affordable Housing**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 21: Affordable Housing

Reference No. 839

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Home Builders Federation Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 21 – Affordable Housing

We have been unable to locate a Local Plan Viability Assessment that provides the evidence to justify the rates for affordable housing that are set out in this policy.

We note the existence of a Good Practice Guide - Internal Space Standard for New Homes. The Council refers to this on its website. In the same section of the website it refers to its intention to introduce a policy for space standards in the local plan. It is unclear whether it is the Council's intention to do so in the Part 1 or the Part 2 Plan. If the Council chooses to pursue this in the Part 2 Plan then it will still need to assess the cost implications of specifying such standards. It will need to complete a new viability assessment to accompany the Part 2 Plan. However, the scope for the Council to introduce such a policy will have been constrained by the local plan policies fixed by the Part 1 plan.

In the meantime, the Good Practice Guide - Internal Space Standard for New Homes can carry no weight. It is contrary to the NPPF to introduce such standards outside of the Local Plan examination process (e.g. paragraph 153 of the NPPF). Because this guidance will not have been tested through the Part 1 Plan the Council has not justified the case for internal residential space standards.

I hope these comments are useful and will help to inform the next iteration of the plan.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 22: Density**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 22: Density

Reference No. 840

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Cemex UK Properties Ltd

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Deloitte Real Estate

Revised Draft Policy 3: Housing Provision, states that during the plan period (2011 – 2031) there will be 1050 houses delivered on brownfield sites in the Shoreham Harbour broad location and Revised Draft Policy 22: Density, states that new residential developments should achieve densities of a minimum of 35 dwellings per hectare, but development in the defined town/village centres and Shoreham Harbour will be expected to achieve higher densities. CEMEX broadly supports these policies, however the responsibility of ensuring that noise generated by local employment functions does not disturb new residents should fall with the developers. Development that prejudiced the continued use of the CEMEX site or resulted in operational restrictions being put in place would be contrary to NPPF Paragraph 21 bullet point 3 and Paragraph 143 bullet point 4.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 22: Density

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We support this policy. The densities proposed seem to be sufficient but with the requirement to supply some green space (Policy 32) as well we wonder if there will be pressure to go upwards and a thus a maximum height limit may be required in some areas to prevent adverse impact on the character of the town. Areas such as Shoreham Beach which are outside the conservation area may require special mention in the Local Plan with regard to a lower density (bungalows) to retain character.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 23: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 23: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and

Reference No. 891

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Southern Water

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Southern Water endeavours to operate its wastewater and sludge treatment works efficiently and in accordance with best practice to prevent pollution. However, unpleasant odours inevitably arise as a result of the treatment processes that occur. New development must be adequately separated from wastewater treatment works, to safeguard amenity for occupants, including gypsies and travellers.

This planning principle is established in the document Planning policy for traveller sites, published by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) in March 2012. Paragraph 11 e) requires local planning authorities to ensure that their policies properly consider the effect of local environmental quality, such as noise and air quality, on the health and well-being of travellers.

Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that the planning system should prevent new development from being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable pollution. Annex 2 of the NPPF establishes that pollution includes odour and noise. Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that 'To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account'.

Therefore, it is considered that an additional criteria should be added to Revised Draft Policy 23 as follows: 'The site should not be adversely affected by pollution, including noise and odour, so that the amenity and well-being of occupants is protected. Proposals adjacent to wastewater treatment facilities will only be permitted if the distance between the facility and the development is sufficient to allow adequate odour dispersion'.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 23: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 23: It is agreed that development of this type in areas of high flood risk should be avoided where possible, with risks fully mitigated where it does occur.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 23: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and

Reference No. 966

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Arun District Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are glad to see that there is scope within the strategic sites policies for consideration, if needed for accommodating or providing for an element of the Gypsy and Traveller needs. However, we feel that an addition to policy 23 referencing incorporation of the outcome of the sites assessment work being done, would ensure its robustness.

Additionally we are glad to see that all possible sites in the countryside have been reconsidered for incorporation and extension to built up areas proposed as necessary, taking account of the environmental characteristics.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 23: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We have some concerns as to the wording of this policy. Whilst we support the inclusion of criteria within the Policy that sites are not located in areas of high flood risk (Flood Zone 3), the policy goes on to state that “where satisfactory flood risk mitigation measures are proposed however, development may be considered”.

The NPPF states that “inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk”. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF sets out how this policy should be implemented and states “that only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 should the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3 be considered, taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the Exception Test if required.”

Caravans and mobile homes intended for permanent residential use are defined as highly vulnerable. Table 3 indicates that uses of this vulnerability should not be permitted in this Flood Zone.

We would therefore have concerns of the consistency of this section of the Policy with the NPPF. To overcome we would recommend that you remove this section.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 24: Safeguarding Existing Gypsy, Traveller**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 24: Safeguarding Existing Gypsy, Traveller

Reference No. 966

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Arun District Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We are glad to see that there is scope within the strategic sites policies for consideration, if needed for accommodating or providing for an element of the Gypsy and Traveller needs.

Additionally we are glad to see that all possible sites in the countryside have been reconsidered for incorporation and extension to built up areas proposed as necessary, taking account of the environmental characteristics.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 24: Safeguarding Existing Gypsy, Traveller

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

As drafted the intention of this policy is unclear. The first paragraph refers to new site/s that may come forward during the Local Plan period; however, it is not clear whether this refers to additional sites at Withy Patch, or more widely within the District. We would seek further clarification as to the intention of this policy.

The Withy Patch site is located within Flood Zone 3. Any further development of this site would therefore be contrary to the NPPF, as discussed above.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 25: Enhancing Existing Employment Sites**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 25: Enhancing Existing Employment Sites

Reference No. 916

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Hargreaves Management Limited

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Representations from Hargreaves Management Limited

As significant landowners within the Adur area and particularly, Shoreham, Hargreaves have considered the revised draft Local Plan and have the following comments / observations.

Revised Draft Policy 25

This is supported in its entirety.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 25: Enhancing Existing Employment Sites

Reference No. 966

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Arun District Council

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are glad to see that there is scope within the strategic sites policies for consideration, if needed for accommodating or providing for an element of the Gypsy and Traveller needs.

Policy 25 - though understood and supported in terms of the employment aspect of the Plan it would be helpful for the Harbour as well as Shoreham Airport be included into this policy.

Additionally we are glad to see that all possible sites in the countryside have been reconsidered for incorporation and extension to built up areas proposed as necessary, taking account of the environmental characteristics.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 25: Protecting and Enhancing Employment**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 25: Protecting and Enhancing Employment

Reference No. 1168

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Ricardo

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The newly allocated employment land needs to be added to this list

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 26: The Visitor Economy**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 26: The Visitor Economy

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

No mention of equestrianism which is part of the rural economy. No mention of the importance of the PRow network, which is the principal means of access to the countryside and must be protected and enhanced where possible.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 26: The Visitor Economy

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We seek this policy to utilise opportunities to increase awareness and respect from visitors to Adur District regarding the value of biodiversity. While this policy encourages minimising the impact on the environment, there is scope to include enhancements for any future tourist developments. This would be in line with the NPPF "Opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged" paragraph 118.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 26: The Visitor Economy

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Equestrianism is a significant part of the rural economy as stated earlier, as are Public Rights of Way which should be included in the wording of this Policy.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 26: The Visitor Economy

Reference No. 19

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

I support this policy. We very much need a hotel in Shoreham. Visitors provide significant employment and retail opportunities, which are to be welcomed. The number of cyclists is increasing and new cycleways and slipways are badly needed.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 26: The Visitor Economy

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support the need for a hotel in Shoreham. Published plans for the North Ropetackle development seem to include a hotel and we hope it happens. Members have also suggested that the Civic Centre would make a very attractive 'gateway' hotel site. The highest bidder, however, may simply want to build flats and we are unsure as to how ADC could encourage a hotel here.

- To add to the visitor economy the hotel should be able to cope with small conferences and conventions.
  - Flats with a hotel below can be combined successfully and could be encouraged if a hotel alone was unviable (eg on Civic Centre site)
  - Evening car parking is a factor for the visitor economy. We note that some towns charge 24-hours for car parks. This should be resisted to assist our arts venues, restaurants and festival events.
  - The Civic Centre ex-Staff Car Park, if competitively priced, could be a valuable visitor asset.
-

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 27: Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 27: Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades

Reference No. 887

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The Co-operative Group

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation Barton Willmore LLP

**BACKGROUND**

1. We act on behalf of The Co-operative Group (“the Co-op”) and have been instructed to submit representations to the consultation on the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013. This follows the submission of representations to the previous consultation on the Draft Local Plan in October 2012.
2. The Co-op is an important stakeholder in Adur District, operating Town Centre ‘Co-operative Food’ stores in Shoreham-by-Sea, Southwick and Lancing. These stores all perform important anchor roles for their respective Town Centres, generating trade, footfall and associated spin-off benefits for other retailers, in turn providing a valuable contribution to Town Centre vitality and viability.
3. Against this background, we set out our comments on the Revised Draft Local Plan 2013 and its performance against the soundness tests contained at NPPF paragraph 182.

**Policy 27 – Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades**

The Co-op supports the revised Policy, which directs retail development to the Primary Shopping Area of the Town Centres in the first instance and requires schemes to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF sequential and impact tests.

The Co-op also supports the introduction of a threshold for undertaking an impact assessment. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the Policy should clarify whether the proposed threshold of 1,000 sq m is gross or net (sales) floorspace.

**Recommended Changes To The Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013**

For the reasons set out above, the Co-op generally supports the Revised Draft Local Plan in its current form. However, the Co-op has some concerns with the detailed wording of Policies and recommends the following changes in order to make the Plan sound:

- Amend Draft Policy 27 to clarify the threshold for undertaking an impact assessment.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 27: Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support this policy in particular paragraph 4.71 decreasing the threshold limit for a retail impact statement.

- The protection of town centre and local parades and car parking to encourage the visitor economy will help the town centre to look and feel vibrant and resist stiff competition from edge-of-town stores such as Morrisons, Lidl and whatever the Parcellforce site produces.
- Pedestrian routeways such as re-opening the level crossing subway and a footbridge to riverside and Morrisons across the A259 would make the town a more attractive place to shop.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 27: Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades

Reference No. 904

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The Theatres Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 27 Retail, Town Centres and Local Parades

We reiterate that this draft policy only deals with retail matters and it should also contain guidance for other town centre uses as recommended in the NPPF in item 23 on page 7 regarding the vitality of town centres which states that a range of suitable sites should be allocated to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres.

In the current Planning magazine, Chris Shepley, chair of the National Retail Planning Forum and a former chief planning inspector, warns that to consider only the question of retail in town centres is misguided. "Any town centre is a combination of the retail offer, the tourist facilities, the community, arts, cultural facilities, restaurants and so on. All those things make it work and create the influence, prosperity and reputation of the town".

This policy should be more robust in considering all aspects of town centres, not just retail.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Para 4.77**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Para 4.77

Reference No. 724

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

There is only one road entry/exit point for Shoreham Beach. The Local Plan should perhaps address this before congestion becomes intolerable or worse: a road accident or fire at The Saltings, effectively sealing off The Beach for vehicular access, followed by a major fire in a block of flats on the Beach to which emergency services cannot respond. No doubt contingency plans are in place, but another access point would be good.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Para 4.79**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Para 4.79

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Transport and Connectivity  
4.79: Please remove the first sentence.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Transport and Connectivity**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Transport and Connectivity

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Policy 28 – Transport & Connectivity including Transport Assessment Report  
(Appendix RD 10)

We have already commented on measures to address on- and off-street parking.

While we recognise that Policy 28 addresses the outlined transport and connectivity issues, quite frankly we fail to see how some of it will be achieved. The draft Plan puts the onus on new development to “improve public transport”, “mitigate air pollution” and “minimise the need for travel”. Surely new development will increase the need to travel, increase air pollution and public transport is already quite good although, in spite of that, many prefer their cars. Without a more proactive approach in the Plan (and we suggest a few) we believe things will just get worse and the Plan will have done a great disservice to Shoreham.

For example, to alleviate traffic congestion on the A259 members have suggested a parallel route along Dolphin Road. Also a footbridge would be preferable to stop-start pelican crossings to Morrisons; this would be an exciting new pedestrian route linking town/station and harbourside developments (i.e. ‘key sites’).

The Transport Assessment: Appendix RD 10

The Parsons Brinckerhoff study assesses thirteen junctions of which three are of particular interest to Shoreham, so we have commented on their proposals. Others outside our area may, of course, be important in bringing in and clearing traffic from Shoreham.

- A27 Sussex Pad (and Ricardos) – The highway mitigation proposal is to allow ahead vehicles to use the nearside lane of the A27 in both directions; cost £11,000. But then it will have to merge again to the existing highway so what will be achieved? We suggest the roundabout on Map 7 Option 1 is superior and this can serve the New Monks Farm Estate. It then supports an enhanced road south to the Saltings Roundabout, serving the new industrial development plus new public transport links to the Airport.
  - A27/A283 Steyning Road junction (Flyover roundabout) – The highway mitigation proposal is basically traffic lights; cost £2.6m. Unless part-time signals are employed this will be completely unnecessary most of the time and a source of annoyance (expensive, and cause massive traffic delays during installation?) We think that the Airport road suggested above will relieve this roundabout and be a better use of the money.
  - A283/A259 Shoreham High Street Junction (Ropetackle roundabout) – The highway mitigation proposal is to “expand the roundabout” somehow and widen the approach by the Tanning Shop; cost £15,534. We really doubt that this will achieve much, although it’s cheap. The required “significant reduction in anticipated traffic demand” will make a difference and is effectively achieved by the aforementioned road through the Airport.
-

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Transport and Connectivity

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

#### Transport

The County Council has worked collaboratively to inform the Adur Local Plan and Shoreham Harbour Transport Study and on the basis of a technical assessment of the work carried out, supports its conclusions. There is reasonable confidence that the package of local transport infrastructure improvements and smarter choices measures (or a similar package of measures) is likely to provide sufficient mitigation so that any residual cumulative impacts would not be severe. This is the key test imposed by the NPPF.

Over the Local Plan period, traffic conditions in a few locations are likely to worsen, although these are generally balanced by improvements in conditions elsewhere on the local highway network. This is shown by a journey time analysis of seven key corridors through the study area, which indicates that average journey times with the most intensive development scenario and mitigation will show either improvements or be no worse off compared to reference case in 20 of 28 cases. These 28 cases relate to two directions of travel for both AM and PM peaks for each of the seven routes. Five further individual junction improvements were recommended based on junction analysis, but not subsequently added to the model networks, which may further improve on the forecast journey times. In order to accommodate the planned development and be most effective, it will be important to ensure that the mitigation package is comprehensively delivered.

A range of scenarios for housing development were tested. The scenario (B) taken forward for mitigation testing includes a higher quantum of development than the preferred development scenario in the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan and therefore provides sufficient evidence to support the Local Plan allocations. However, Adur DC may wish to test the preferred development scenario through an additional model test and allow for the mitigation package to be refined to reflect the absence of the Hasler site. This would provide further evidence to inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Transport and Connectivity

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Bullet Point 4 - Equestrians (where appropriate) should be included in the wording. Riders are also vulnerable road users along with walkers and cyclists, their omission cannot be justified.

Strongly support encouragement of new and improved prowl, which should be multi-use for maximum public benefit.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Transport and Connectivity

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Pleased with para 4.73 and 4.76 and the need to improve routes for walkers and cyclists, but routes should be multi-use to benefit all vulnerable users.

Bullet point 4 - is strongly supported, especially the reference to new and improved PRow, and improved access across the A27. However, this Policy should specifically acknowledge the strategic importance of the Downs Link and should also refer to the West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 28: Transport and Connectivity

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We would seek to see joins between transport, connectivity and the potential to deliver transport links with that of green infrastructure in the form of footpaths and cycleway. Therefore supporting Public Rights of Way to deliver this multi functional green space is vital. We would also seek that the policy includes wording to resist the paving over of front gardens for private parking, in recognition of the biodiversity and connectivity value of these spaces in built urban areas. Local authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.' NPPF Section 53

---

### Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

New houses mean new and greater demand for access to the countryside - large new developments must require an access audit as part of the design process.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We welcome the recognition of green infrastructure within the section 4.84 and feel the policy has the potential to deliver considerably to the growth in natural capital for the district. The policy could ask that all development contribute to the green infrastructure needs not only necessary as part of the development itself, but of the green infrastructure needs of the district as a whole, on a proportional scale to the development.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 1169

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Adur & Worthing Business Partnership

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

The AWBP is concerned that infrastructure constraints put development at risk and consequently the necessary flooding and transport infrastructure needs to be put into place in advance.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)

The County Council will continue to support Adur DC with the preparation of the IDP. A Strategic Infrastructure Package is being developed to set out improvements associated with the preferred development scenario. The Adur County Local Committee (CLC) has been working to identify local priorities to inform the selection of highway schemes. Any work to identify future infrastructure needs should also be informed by these Infrastructure Plan Priorities.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 891

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Southern Water

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Southern Water welcomes and supports Revised Draft Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure. It will help ensure that infrastructure is delivered in time to serve new development as supported by paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Southern Water would expect to enter into an agreement directly with the developer and the costs for local water and wastewater infrastructure fall outside the remit of both the Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 Planning Obligations. It would be useful if the first and third paragraphs of the supporting text and the fourth paragraph of this policy could acknowledge that site specific infrastructure is also achieved through direct agreements with service providers.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 983

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Shoreham Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We would like to see the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and to be able to comment on it as soon as it is available as we think it is integral to the Local Plan. It is somewhat disappointing to see it kept separate or lagging behind the Local Plan, as surely they are interrelated.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 931

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Persimmon Homes South Coast

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation Turley Associates

SEE EMAIL FOR ATTACHMENTS

Our client is undertaking further assessments into the specific infrastructure requirements for Draft Policy 6 and will share this with the Council to assist in updating the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as necessary. We would therefore wish to reserve the right to comment further on this once such information is made available.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support the inclusion of the policy which will ensure development is phased with the provision of necessary infrastructure.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 29: Delivering Infrastructure

Reference No. 987

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Natural England

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Para 118 of the NPPF would need to be considered when considering infrastructure delivery across the plan policies with relation to the Adur Estuary SSSI.

---

### Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure

Reference No. 977

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex Local Access Forum

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

As commented before, mention should be made of the Downs Link. Adur is a small district with a big population and there is a danger of looking only inwards. The green infrastructure must include the adjoining areas of coast and downland because that is where the residents want to go. The Green Infrastructure Strategy must recognise that and aim to improve access to those areas - including sustainable routes and safe crossings of the A27 for residents and visitors. It should also cover enjoyment of the green areas by all NMUs.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure Reference No. 1168  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation Ricardo  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

This should include an efficient road system that minimises traffic delays and emissions from congestion

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure Reference No. 905  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation The British Horse Society  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Para 4.94 - Support inclusion of P.R.o.W. as 'green corridors' and recognition of their contribution to all beneficial aspects of green infrastructure.

Strongly supported. However, somewhere in the wording (or supporting wording) reference should be made to the West Sussex Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure Reference No. 988  
Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy  Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments  
Comments Support  Object  Comment  Agent's Organisation

Green Infrastructure

4.96: The planning, implementation / provision and subsequent long-term management of a strategic network of multi-functional Green Infrastructure (GI) is a key issue, therefore the preparation of a Green Infrastructure Strategy is welcomed. It is suggested that GI should be specifically mentioned as an important element of a masterplan for all strategic sites.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support the requirement for developments to incorporate elements of green infrastructure into their overall design and/or enhance existing. We are also supportive of the Council's statement to work with relevant partners and developers to facilitate the creation of an integrated network of green infrastructure.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 30: Green Infrastructure

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are pleased to see the continued recognition of green infrastructure in the revised draft plan, however we are frustrated that the green infrastructure strategy is not playing a contributory part in the allocation of sites. We are keen that the policy goes further to say that all developments will be required to demonstrate how they contribute to the Green Infrastructure Strategy of Adur District Council. This would then require developers to show green infrastructure both on an internal level of a proposed development boundary and how it links and enhances to the wider district's green infrastructure network.

"Local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross boundary impacts when their local plans are submitted for examination" (NPPF, Para 181).

We are keen that all development within the district and adjoining areas contributes to broader green infrastructure aspirations.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 31: Biodiversity**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 31: Biodiversity

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

The Sussex Wildlife Trust welcome the inclusion of this policy within the revised draft plan and its recognition of the hierarchy of designated sites and Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, we are keen that the sentiments of section 4.99 of the plan are also reflected in the policy. This policy has the opportunity to reflect the NPPF further through highlighting the importance of landscape in the context of connectivity and its ecological function. The Sussex Wildlife Trust feels that this should be incorporated into this policy wording to bring it in line with the NPPF: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services" (NPPF, Para 109). "Set out a strategic approach in their Local plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure" (NPPF, Para 114)

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 31: Biodiversity

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We are pleased to see that our previous comments have been considered and we are supportive of the inclusion of this Policy. We support the requirement that development should protect conserve and where possible enhance biodiversity including nationally and locally designated sites as well as Biodiversity Action Plan habitats and species.

In its current format there is some repetition within the Policy and the second sentence of the first paragraph could be deleted.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 32: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 32: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure

Reference No. 972

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Sussex Wildlife Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We are encouraged by the policy's recognition for the need for a Green Infrastructure and Open Space SPD. We would suggest that Adur DC seek all opportunities to enhance the natural environment through these facilities as a multi-beneficial component of the green infrastructure network.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 32: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure

Reference No. 891

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Southern Water

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Southern Water understands Adur District Council's intention to protect open space within the built up area. However, we can not support the current wording of Revised Draft Policy 32: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure. This is because it could create barriers to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development allocated in the Local Plan.

Southern Water considers that should the need arise, special circumstances exist in relation to the provision of essential water and wastewater infrastructure (e.g. a new pumping station) required to serve new and existing customers. This is because there are limited options available with regard to location, as the infrastructure would need to connect into existing networks. The draft National Planning Practice Guidance recognises this scenario and states that 'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has needs particular to the location (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'.

Although the District Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater or sewerage development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.

Accordingly, we propose the following additional policy provision in Revised Draft Policy 32: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure :

Should the need arise, development for essential infrastructure will be supported in special circumstances, where the benefit outweighs any harm or loss and it can be demonstrated there are no reasonable alternative sites available.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 32: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure

Reference No. 905

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation The British Horse Society

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Mention should be made of facilities for 'informal recreation' (e.g. prow), probably the best used and most important facility providing health and activity benefits for present and future residents.

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 33: Planning for Sustainable Communities**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 33: Planning for Sustainable Communities

Reference No. 904

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation The Theatres Trust

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

Sustainability means keeping and improving facilities and services that are already available. The policy does not state that established facilities and services are to be retained and developed for the benefit of the community as recommended in item 70 of the NPPF.

To reflect the NPPF we strongly suggest that the opening sentence of this policy begins with - The council will protect and improve existing social and community facilities by resisting their loss or change of use which will only be permitted where: .....

Paragraph 4.105 states that improvements may need to be made to existing facilities, but this is not reflected in the policy.

Glossary – the description for the term ‘social and community facilities’ in para.4.105 will not be effective as it is unclear. Although there is an entry in the Glossary for clarity we suggest a more succinct all-inclusive explanation and recommend: social and community facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 34: Pollution and Contamination**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 34: Pollution and Contamination

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

We welcome the requirement for investigations and assessments of sites situated in or in close proximity to potentially contaminated land.

The third paragraph could be rewritten to be made more effective as there is some repetition. In addition the phrase “negative impact on pollution” is unclear. To clarify the intention of the policy we recommend that this is replaced with “that could increase levels of pollution or have a negative impact on drinking water supplies or Air Quality Management Areas.”

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 34: Pollution and Contamination

Reference No. 891

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Southern Water

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Southern Water welcomes the intention of Revised Draft Policy 34: Pollution and Contamination but would like to see stronger policy provision to take into account the amenity of future occupiers, if development proposals come forward adjacent to existing wastewater treatment works, or smaller wastewater facilities such as pumping stations.

In our previous representations, we requested the insertion of the word 'odour' so that the policy provision would read as follows: 'New development in Adur will be located in areas most suitable to the use of that development to avoid risks from noise, air, odour or light pollution'. We are keen to ensure this addition as it is a consideration that is distinct from air quality, as indicated in the National Policy Statement for Wastewater. Whilst air quality can impact upon health, odour can have a bearing upon quality of life.

Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that 'To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account'. Annex 2 of the NPPF identifies that pollution can arise from odour.

Although Southern Water endeavours to operate its wastewater and sludge treatment works efficiently and in accordance with best practice, unpleasant odours inevitably arise from time to time as a result of the treatment processes that occur. For this reason, sensitive development such as housing must be adequately separated from existing wastewater treatment works and other facilities such as pumping stations to safeguard amenity.

Therefore, this amenity consideration should be recognised in the policy.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 34: Pollution and Contamination

Reference No. 35

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Anything that adds to the poor air quality in certain areas should be avoided though with the wider use of electric cars, pollution should decrease. Some of the present industrial/brownfield sites should be developed for housing thus reducing the polluting lorries that clog the road at present.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 34: Pollution and Contamination

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

4.114: Noise Action Plans – Important Areas identified through the DEFRA mapping include A27, A283, A270 and A259. The County Council (as the Local Highway Authority) is required to assess the sites and liaise with the District Council. The Brighton Noise Action Plan is likely to be superseded in 2014 by generic Agglomeration, Major Road and Major Rail Action Plans – these will still carry the same weight. Development should look to limit / mitigate its impacts on traffic noise levels and be designed appropriately to mitigate the impact of traffic noise on any new receptors.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 35: Water Quality and Protection**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 35: Water Quality and Protection

Reference No. 891

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Southern Water

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Southern Water welcomes and supports Revised Draft Policy 35: Water Quality and Protection. It will help ensure that public water supplies are not put at risk.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 35: Water Quality and Protection

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We support the inclusion of this Policy which strengthens the Plan's ability to protect water quality. We recommend that the wording of this Policy could be improved in the first paragraph by requiring that development proposals should protect and enhance ground and surface water features to help achieve the objectives of the Water Framework Directive.

We also support the inclusion of the second paragraph that makes specific reference to the need for a preliminary risk assessment for any development where there is potential risk of contamination of controlled waters.

However we consider there is some repetition between Policies 34 and 35 and the intention and purpose of each Policy should be considered to improve clarity and avoid duplication. We would be happy to work with you to review both these policies.

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

**Flood Risk**

The County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) fully supports the Vision and Objectives relating to flood risk set out in the revised draft Local Plan. However, there are concerns regarding the allocation of major sites within the high risk flood zones 3a and 3b, especially Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm. These sites are not only currently known to be at risk from fluvial and tidal flooding, but also from surface water and groundwater flooding, as well as flooding from foul sewers. Whilst it is accepted that these sites pass the Sequential Test (due to lack of available developable land outside of flood risk areas) and Part 1 of the Exception Test (the benefits of sustainable development outweighing the negatives), it is the view of the County Council that it has yet to be proven that Part 2 of the Exception Test can be definitively passed at this stage.

In order to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the Exception Test as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and associated guidance, the Local Plan should demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime, the residual risks of flooding to people and property (including the likely effects of climate change) are acceptable and can be satisfactorily managed. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) 2012 does not include the level of detail required that is set out in paragraph 8 of Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework to demonstrate that Part 2 can be met according to paragraph 102 of the NPPF at the Local Plan Stage. Whilst it is accepted that the majority of this detail should be provided at the application stage, with Site Specific Flood Risk Assessments, the current draft NPPF guidance (online on the planning portal) also indicates that this should be done at the Local Plan stage. Adur District Council should ensure that it is satisfied that it has been demonstrated that flood risk issues at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm can be technically and practically overcome to meet Part 2 of the Exception Test, as well as assessing proposed mitigation measures in greater detail at the application stage to ensure that they have been overcome.

Given that there is insufficient information to demonstrate that flood risk can be adequately mitigated, the removal of Hasler as a proposed allocation is supported.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

Reference No. 944

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation Environment Agency

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

We are pleased that to see that our previous recommendations regarding this Policy have been incorporated. We support the inclusion of this policy and consider it will be effective in ensuring flood risk in the District is reduced.

We also note the requirement for Flood Risk Assessments where flood risk from other sources is identified. Paragraph 4.126 outlines the evidence that supports this requirement. You may also wish to refer to evidence of local historic flooding to provide additional justification. Although we consider this positive, in its current format it applies to all development regardless of size. You may wish to consider the proportionality of this requirement for all types of developments as well as who would review this information at the planning application stage.

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

Reference No. 986

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Flood Risk (Revised Draft Policy 36)

The Revised DLP should comply with NPPF (paragraph 100) by directing development (such as that proposed at Shoreham Airport) away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere and safeguarding land from development that is required for current and future flood management. (The implication of the SFRA report is that improvement to the tidal defences to the west bank of the River Adur in order to protect a functional flood plain will adversely impact land to the east putting The Steyning Road site and the surrounding area of the A27/A283 interchange at greater risk of flooding. Resources should be focused on improving protection to the east side of the River Adur and associated infrastructure. To do otherwise would be contrary to the NPPF.)

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Revised Draft Policy 36: Under 'The flood risk assessment will need to demonstrate that development:' please add 'that higher vulnerability uses have been located on parts of the site at lowest probability of flooding'.

Please amend the third bullet point to read: 'will not increase flood risk (including sewer flooding, surface water and groundwater flood risk) elsewhere'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

4.125: In the fourth sentence, please remove 'the' before 'West Sussex County Council's and add 'Local' before 'Flood Risk Management Strategy'.

---

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage

Reference No. 32

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy

Organisation

Comments Support  Object  Comment

Agent's Organisation

NO MORE BUILDING ON OUR FLOOD PLAIN!  
THE FLOOD PLAIN PROTECTS OUR HOMES!  
ANY MORE BUILDINGS AND WE WILL FLOOD!!

---

**Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Para 4.130**

Map/Para/Policy: Policy 36: Para 4.130

Reference No. 988

Relates To Map  Relates To Paragraph  Relates to Policy 

Organisation West Sussex County Council Officer comments

Comments Support  Object  Comment 

Agent's Organisation

4.130 (and Part 3 of the supporting document: Sequential and Exceptions Test for the Revised Draft Adur Local Plan 2013): This paragraph currently states that the second part of the exceptions test would be undertaken at the planning application stage. However, paragraph 102 of the NPPF states that 'both elements of the test will have to be passed for development to be allocated or permitted'.

The SFRA (Updated 2012) does not include the level of detail required (as set out in paragraph 8 of Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework) to demonstrate that Part 2 has been met according to paragraph 102 of the NPPF. The current draft NPPF guidance also indicates that Part 2 should be satisfied at the Local Plan stage. Adur District Council should ensure that it has been demonstrated at this stage that flood risk issues at Shoreham Airport and New Monks Farm can be technically and practically overcome to meet Part 2 of the Exception Test.

---