I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGVs plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safety any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds. WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGV’s plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV's.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV's turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSFFC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV's operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV's and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSFFC but have not been risk assessed. verge damage is not disputed by WSFFC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people's lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV's a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSFFC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGV's plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake lane as a 'horticultural hub'? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven't these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. P. Stapleton

RECEIVED
13 MAY 2016
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 690 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGV’s plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:-

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DMT should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 600 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGV’s plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permission as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,

[Handwritten signature]
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGV’s plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

RECEIVED
13 MAY 2016
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCLC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCLC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DMT1 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCLC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGV’s plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:-

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV's.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV's turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural Industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV's operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV's and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people's lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV's a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGVs plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a 'horticultural hub'? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven't these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton - Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order - Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Vapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:-

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGVs.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Vapton Railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV's turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Vapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV's operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV's and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people's lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV's a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGVs plus tractor and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake lane as a 'horticultural hub'? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven't these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton - Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,
I am writing to object to the Local Development Order – Horticultural Order designated area Barnham, Yapton, Walberton, and Eastergate. Reasons for objections:

The proposed HDO areas are in semi-rural areas amongst the villages. The lanes are not suitable to sustain safely any more Horticultural tractors or HGV’s.

WSCC Highways have not measured or risk assessed how the current horticultural traffic affects the lanes, local amenity, safety and the environment.

Lake Lane is the only service road to the Barnham designated area is already unsafe. Lake lane and Yapton railway junction is chaotic and unsafe due to over-long HGV’s turning in and out into the narrow Lake lane entrance. The hazards at Yapton railway junction were reported to WSCC and ADC but despite them they still allowed planning permission to be lifted without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail which is why the junction is now compromised. These factors make the designated area Barnham off Lake lane totally unsuitable as a site for expansion by lifting planning restrictions.

The villages want to retain their semi-rural character creating a horticultural industrial estate amongst the villages will add to the further erosion of the countryside something I seek to protect.

Travelling to access the fields or to other villages using the lanes especially Lake lane is already unsafe. The lane where the HGV’s operate has no street lights or pavements. HGV’s and tractors straddle the whole lane leaving no room for pedestrians and cyclists. In many areas they use public verges as road extensions on a daily basis putting local people at risk of serious harm. These hazards have been reported to both ADC and WSCC but have not been risk assessed. Verge damage is not disputed by WSCC.

The elderly and young have lost amenity being too frightened to travel along the lanes to visit the shops or neighbours. Cyclists and pedestrians are very vulnerable because no safety measures have been put in place along the service roads and the horticultural sites have been expanded without considering how they affect local people’s lives.

Horticultural sites should not be exempt from planning restrictions adding glass-houses, packing sheds etc. will all impact the safety of the local Highway and affect local amenity through noise and light pollution.

Policy DM11 should be upheld. In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV’s a year and planning permission was refused on Highway safety grounds WSCC Highways own count shows there are 24,000 a yr operating along Lake lane.

If there are that many HGVs plus tractors and trailers currently operating unsafely along Lake lane why have ADC designated the area off Lake Lane as a ‘horticultural hub’? If it is documented that Lake lane is already unsafe at the junction and along Lake lane why haven’t these details been taken into account before designating the Walberton – Barnham fields off Lake lane a Horticultural Order area? Is public safety not a consideration in 2016?

The HDO is unsound and any expansion should be rejected – the designated areas is unsuitable for any lifting of planning permissions as to do so will put all road users at risk of potential harm.

Yours faithfully,
OBJECTION TO HORTICULTURAL ORDER

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I am unhappy at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area’s character is that is semi-rural. I have grandchildren who ride but the lanes are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV’s and tractors.

Lifting planning restriction is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70’s the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV’s and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV’s operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution buildings mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane (service road HGV’s/tractors) is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged making it continually dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV’s) for ordinary people.

Lifting permissions and adding on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and how it affects local people should have been examined before designating the HDO areas.

Yours faithfully,
OBJECTION TO HORTICULTURAL ORDER

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I am unhappy at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area’s character is that is semi-rural. I have grandchildren and we use the lanes to access the countryside or travel between the villages and are the are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV’s and tractors.

Lifting planning restriction is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70’s the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV’s and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV’s operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution buildings mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane (service road HGV’s/tractors) is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged making it continually dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV’s) for ordinary people.

Lifting permissions and adding on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and how it affects local people should have been examined before designating the HDO areas.

Yours faithfully,
To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I alarmed at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area's character is that is semi-rural. I cycle and I use the lanes to access the countryside or travel between the villages and are the are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV's and tractors.

Lifting planning restriction is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70's the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV's and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV's operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution buildings mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane (service road HGV's/tractors) is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged making it continually dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV's) for ordinary people.

Lifting permissions and adding on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and how it affects local people should have been examined before designating the HDO areas.

Yours faithfully,
ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL
CONSULTATION HORTICULTURAL ORDER (object)

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I alarmed at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area's character is that is semi-rural. I cycle and I use the lanes to access the countryside or travel between the villages and are the are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV's and tractors.

Lifting planning restriction is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70's the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV's and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuit for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV's operating..

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution buildings mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane (service road HGV's/tractors) is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged making it continually dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV's) for ordinary people.

Lifting permissions and adding on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and how it affects local people should have been examined before designating the HDO areas.

Yours faithfully,
OBJECTION TO LDO – HDO

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I am appalled at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area’s character is that is semi-rural. I am a dog-walker who uses fields but the lanes are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV’s and tractors.

Lifting planning restrictions may increase horticultural site owners profits but it is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70’s the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV’s and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV’s operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution centres mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged making it dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV’s) for ordinary people.

Please re-consider the HDO trying to add on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and local amenity should also have been included.

Yours faithfully,
OBJECTION TO HORTICULTURAL ORDER

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I am unhappy at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area’s character is that is semi-rural. I have grandchildren and we use the lanes to access the countryside or travel between the villages and are the area becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV’s and tractors.

Lifting planning restriction is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70’s the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV’s and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft.HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV’s operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution buildings mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane (service road HGV’s/tractors) is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of potholes and the road edging/verges damaged making it continually dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV’s) for ordinary people.

Lifting permissions and adding on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and how it affects local people should have been examined before designating the HDO areas.

Yours faithfully,
OBJECTION TO LDO – HDO

To whom it may concern,

I have lived in the area for many years and I am appalled at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area’s character is that is semi-rural. I am a dog-walker who uses to use the fields but the lanes are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV’s and tractors.

Lifting planning restrictions may increase horticultural site owners profits but it is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70’s the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV’s and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV’s operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution centres mean goods are bought onto the site meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

The Lake Lane is not fit for purpose already because it has been damaged. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged making it dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV’s) for ordinary people.

Please re-consider the HDO trying to add on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and local amenity should also have been included.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

RECEIVED
13 MAY 2016
Objection to Horticultural Development Order

I am writing in regards to the HDO. I work as a taxi driver for Barnham and object to this Order.

Escorting passengers along Lake Lane safely has become impossible with the increased frequency of HGV’s. It is dangerous and often impossible to use the road whilst it is occupied by these service Lorries, as there is no room to steer by them. Allowing any further expansion which results HGV’s and tractors and trailers using Lake lane as service road for HGV’s servicing the horticultural sites should not be allowed until the road is risk assessed and a safety audit is undertaken. Allowing further expansion without counting and regulating the HGV’s currently using the lanes and Yapton railway junction is unsound.

The HGV’s also contribute to the deterioration of the road, which already contains potholes. HGV’s make this problem worse and also create their own damage to the road, making travelling up Lake Lane an experience which creates large costs for car repairs.

The HGV’s already create unsafe motoring conditions any additional increase or change of use of the Horticultural nurseries adjacent to Lake lane (Walberton and Yapton) should not be allowed without public consultation and a full Highway written assessment of how the change of use will affect the local lanes (Lake lane, Yapton Lane and Yapton junction).

Yours sincerely,
Objection to Horticultural Development Order

I am writing in regards to the HDO. I work as a taxi driver for Barnham and object to this Order.

 Escorting passengers along Lake Lane safely has become impossible with the increased frequency of HGV’s. It is dangerous and often impossible to use the road whilst it is occupied by these service Lorries, as there is no room to steer by them. Allowing any further expansion which results HGV’s and tractors and trailers using Lake lane as service road for HGV’s servicing the horticultural sites should not be allowed until the road is risk assessed and a safety audit is undertaken. Allowing further expansion without counting and regulating the HGV’s currently using the lanes and Yaption railway junction is unsound.

The HGV’s also contribute to the deterioration of the road, which already contains potholes. HGV’s make this problem worse and also create their own damage to the road, making travelling up Lake Lane an experience which creates large costs for car repairs.

The HGV’s already create unsafe motoring conditions any additional increase or change of use of the Horticultural nurseries adjacent to Lake lane (Walberton and Yaptan) should not be allowed without public consultation and a full Highway written assessment of how the change of use will affect the local lanes (Lake lane, Yaptan Lane and Yaptan junction).

Yours sincerely,

Alan Murray

RECEIVED
13 MAY 2016
Objection to Horticultural Development Order

I am writing in regards to the HDO. I work as a taxi driver for Barnham and object to this Order.

Escorting passengers along Lake Lane safely has become impossible with the increased frequency of HGV’s. It is dangerous and often impossible to use the road whilst it is occupied by these service Lorries, as there is no room to steer by them. Allowing any further expansion which results HGV’s and tractors and trailers using Lake lane as service road for HGV’s servicing the horticultural sites should not be allowed until the road is risk assessed and a safety audit is undertaken. Allowing further expansion without counting and regulating the HGV’s currently using the lanes and Yapton railway junction is unsound.

The HGV’s also contribute to the deterioration of the road, which already contains potholes. HGV’s make this problem worse and also create their own damage to the road, making travelling up Lake Lane an experience which creates large costs for car repairs.

The HGV’s already create unsafe motoring conditions any additional increase or change of use of the Horticultural nurseries adjacent to Lake lane (Walberton and Yapton) should not be allowed without public consultation and a full Highway written assessment of how the change of use will affect the local lanes (Lake lane, Yapton Lane and Yapton junction).

Yours sincerely,

[Receipt stamp: 13 May 2016]
Objection to Horticultural Development Order

I am writing in regards to the HDO. I work as a taxi driver for Barnham and object to this Order.

Escorting passengers along Lake Lane safely has become impossible with the increased frequency of HGV’s. It is dangerous and often impossible to use the road whilst it is occupied by these service Lorries, as there is no room to steer by them. Allowing any further expansion which results in HGV’s and tractors and trailers using Lake lane as service road for the horticultural sites should not be allowed, until the road is risk assessed and a safety audit is undertaken. Allowing further expansion without counting and regulating the HGV’s currently using the lanes and Yapton railway junction is unsound. The lane is meant to be weight restricted and access only.

The HGV’s also contribute to the deterioration of the road, which already contains potholes. HGV’s make this problem worse and also creates their own damage to the road, making travelling up Lake Lane an experience which creates large costs for car repairs.

The HGV’s already create unsafe motoring conditions any additional increase or change of use of the Horticultural nurseries adjacent to Lake lane (Walberton and Yapton) should not be allowed without public consultation and a full Highway written assessment of how the change of use will affect the local lanes (Lake lane, Yapton Lane and Yapton junction).

Yours sincerely,
Horticultural Development Order
Management Support Planning Services

To Arun District Council,

I object to the Horticultural Development order Barnham Walberton Yapton Horticultural designated area.

The local roads, especially Lake Lane and junction are not able to safely sustain the current Horticultural service traffic and expanding the horticultural sites will increase HGV's and tractors using the public Highway therefore I object to the order as there is absolutely no guarantee that the expansion will not affect the roads (Lake Lane) and villages.

Damage by HGV's to the verges and road already causes unsafe travelling conditions therefore instead of expanding the horticultural sites in this area WSCC Highways should be regulating and limiting the horticultural service HGV's and tractors on Lake Lane as it not fit for purpose.

Taking away local people's rights to have a say in what happens to the environment in which they live and work is unjust.

Highways do not regulate the numbers of HGV's already operating so the lane is dangerously potholed and road side eroded. If the numbers of HGV's currently operating is unknown along Lake lane how will Highway safety be measured when future change of use is given? How will WSCC measure the effect the change of use will have on the Highway and people's safety? The Horticultural Development order will lift planning restrictions and allow change without measuring how the sites will affect the roads and lives of the local community. Allowing more freedom to develop horticultural sites without measuring the wider consequences for the community should be questioned.

Planning restrictions were put in place to help create safe and sustainable developments and should be open to public debate to help measure whether they will affect local people. Imposing a Horticultural order may increase horticultural profits but it will be done without due diligence or thought for residential amenity or safety.

Yours sincerely

(\text{signature})

\text{RECEIVED}
13 \text{ MAY} 2016
Horticultural Development Order

Management Support Planning Services

Dear Sir,

I object to the Horticultural Development order Barnham Walberton Yapton Horticultural designated area.

The local roads, especially lake Lane and junction are not able to safely sustain the current Horticultural service traffic and expanding the horticultural sites will increase HGV's and tractors using the public Highway therefore I object to the order as there is absolutely no guarantee that the expansion will not affect the roads (Lake Lane).

Damage by HGV's to the verges and road already causes unsafe travelling conditions therefore instead of expanding the horticultural sites in this area WSCC Highways should be regulating and limiting the horticultural service HGV's and tractors on Lake Lane as it not fit for purpose.

Taking away local people's rights to have a say in what happens to the environment in which they live and work is unjust.

Highways do not regulate the numbers of HGV's already operating so the lane is dangerously pot-holed and road side eroded. If the numbers of HGV's currently operating is unknown along Lake lane how will Highway safety be measured when future change of use is given? How will WSCC measure the effect the change of use will have on the Highway and people's safety? The Horticultural Development order will lift planning restrictions and allow change without measuring how the sites will affect the roads and lives of the local community. Allowing more freedom to develop horticultural sites without measuring the wider consequences for the community should be questioned.

Planning restrictions were put in place to help create safe and sustainable developments and should be open to public debate to help measure whether they will affect local people. Imposing a Horticultural order may increase horticultural profits but it will be done without due diligence or thought for residential amenity or safety.

Yours sincerely

[signature]

P.S. I work i Rainbow just Limited Response.
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER – HORTICULTURAL ORDER: OBJECTION LODGED

Dear Sir or Madam,

My objections to the LDO and HDO designated areas are the following:

- Disturbance to residents – from the sites and from the impact of the service HGV’s and tractors using public roads to get to the designated sites which are adjacent to villages.

- Pollution and degradation of a semi-rural area – ADC should be seeking to promote and protect the countryside by restricting any further expansion not destroying it further.

- Lifting planning restrictions will create an increasingly industrial area eroding the countryside which ADC Policy GEN 3 should seek to protect.

Huge road safety implications and degradation to the surface and margins of rural lanes has already occurred due to narrow lane dimensions and lack of HGV regulation. The HDO has not been made in accordance with the Highway Safety Act whereby ‘pedestrians have a right to safe passage’.

No pavements or other safety zones for pedestrians (Lake lane) – HGV’s currently use pedestrian footways as road extensions, hazards which have been reported but not acted on. The designated sites areas are unacceptably located in terms of Highway safety. Current Highway safety hazards reported to both ADC and WSCC have not been risk assessed. The HDO does not comply with Policy DM11.

Lorries currently using the service road (Lake lane) have to mount the verges due to single lane weight restricted road to allow traffic to pass in the opposite direction (Verge damage is acknowledged by WSCC Highways) Horticultural expansion will result in further HGV or tractors movements which will result in environmental damage. Local resident’s driveways are used as passing places and HGV’s frequently reverse backwards into on-coming traffic.

2007 Lake Lake (HDO service road) was deemed unsuitable for more that 680 HGV’s a year and a request for horticultural expansion (lifting planning ) on a site at Old Lake lane Nursery was rejected on Highway Safety Grounds.

WSCC HGV survey shows there are 24,000 +HGV’s a yr. operating along Lake lane. WSCC/ADC have applied different Planning and Highway safety criteria in 2011-16.

In 2011-16 known Highway safety hazards have been excluded and the designated HDO sites ‘horticultural hub’ allocated without any current HGV count, Highway safety audit or risk assessment which contradicts WSCC Highways own safety recommendations of 2007. Clearly, this documentation connected to the HDO (Barnham – Walberton off Lake lane) means that the site allocation is flawed and the impact of the HDO will be ‘detrimental to Highway safety’ and potentially very dangerous.

Yours faithfully,
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER – HORTICULTURAL ORDER: OBJECTION LODGED

Dear Sir or Madam,

My objections to the LDO and HDO designated areas are the following:

Disturbance to residents – from the sites and from the impact of the service HGV’s and tractors using public roads to get to the designated sites which are adjacent to villages.

Pollution and degradation of a semi-rural area – ADC should be seeking to promote and protect the Countryside by restricting any further expansion not destroying it further.

Lifting planning restrictions will create an increasingly industrial area eroding the countryside which ADC Policy GEN 3 should seek to protect.

Huge road safety implications and degradation to the surface and margins of rural lanes has already occurred due to narrow lane dimensions and lack of HGV regulation. The HDO has not been made in accordance with the Highway Safety Act whereby ‘pedestrians have a right to safe passage’.

No pavements or other safety zones for pedestrians (Lake lane) – HGV’s currently use pedestrian footways as road extensions, hazards which have been reported but not acted on. The designated sites areas are unacceptably located in terms of Highway safety. Current Highway safety hazards reported to both ADC and WSCC have not been risk assessed. The HDO does not comply with Policy DM11.

Lorries currently using the service road (Lake lane) have to mount the verges due to single lane weight restricted road to allow traffic to pass in the opposite direction (Verge damage is acknowledged by WSCC Highways) Horticultural expansion will result in further HGV or tractors movements which will result in environmental damage. Local resident’s driveways are used as passing places and HGV’s frequently reverse backwards into on-coming traffic.

2007 Lake Lake (HDO service road) was deemed unsuitable for more that 680 HGV’s a year and a request for horticultural expansion (lifting planning) on a site at Old Lake lane Nursery was rejected on Highway Safety Grounds.

WSCC HGV survey shows there are 24,000 +HGV’s a yr. operating along Lake lane. WSCC/ADC have applied different Planning and Highway safety criteria in 2011-16.

In 2011-16 known Highway safety hazards have been excluded and the designated HDO sites ‘horticultural hub’ allocated without any current HGV count, Highway safety audit or risk assessment which contradicts WSCC Highways own safety recommendations of 2007. Clearly, this documentation connected to the HDO (Barnham – Walberton off Lake lane) means that the site allocation is flawed and the impact of the HDO will be ‘detrimental to Highway safety’ and potentially very dangerous.

Yours faithfully,  

A. H. Crane
ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL HORTICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER.

To whom it may concern

I oppose the order. The local roads are unsuitable for further horticultural development. Lake Lane and Yapton junction is already unsafe because planning permissions were given without ADC taking safety into account and planning how extra HGV's/tractors would affect the environment.

The impact of the current horticultural HGV's and tractors has not been measured with no public safety audit or up to date HGV count showing how the HGV's already affect Highway capacity and residential amenity. Expanding horticultural sites by lifting permissions will add to the service HGV's/tractors using the village lanes. WSCC and ADC should adhere to Policy DM 11 restricting horticultural development that will affect the local public Highway.

The local environment is already damaged with verges eroded because the HGV's take up the whole road space and the verges making travel precarious for pedestrians and cyclists.

Horticultural sites have already been used for housing eroding the fields and countryside further. Creating added horticultural industrialisation in the fields is unacceptable and adds to the urbanisation of the semi-rural villages.

A horticultural hub should only be created if strict safety rules can be applied. The narrow country lanes mean pedestrians and cyclists are only separated inches away from HGV's and tractors taking up the entire road space. The designated HDO areas are not suitable or sustainable and until the lanes are risk assessed and policy DM11 implemented I cannot support the HDO. Please register the above concerns.

Yours faithfully,
OBJECTION TO LDO – HDO

To whom it may concern,

I am appalled at the way the area is becoming increasing industrialised. Part of the area’s character is that is semi-rural. I am a dog-walker who uses Walberton and Yapton fields but the lanes to fields are becoming saturated with excessive horticultural service HGV’s and tractors.

Lifting planning restrictions may increase horticultural site owners profits but it is at the expense of local amenity and a way of life. In the 70’s the horticultural sites were smaller and restricted to what was grown on the site which limited the amount of service HGV’s and tractors using the lanes to collect the produce. ADC have allowed the nurseries to get bigger but the tiny rural lanes have stayed the same and road damage and eroded verges is the result. Lake lane is weight restricted and was intended for occasional HGV use hence the Access only requirement it is unsuited for 44ft HGV movements as the lane is very narrow (single-lane) WSCC Highways should have limited the amount of HGV’s operating.

Changing older horticultural sites to pack-houses and distribution centres are industrial enterprises because these units generate additional goods. Pack houses/distribution centres mean goods are bought onto the site or collected meaning 24/7 HGV movements along the lanes.

Lake Lane is not fit for purpose it is an old country lane unable to withstand the weight of the current 44ft. HGV’s. Adding more would be foolhardy. The road is full of pot-holes and the road edging/verges damaged because it is too narrow to sustain the current HGV’s making it dangerous for everyone using it.

Unfortunately the horticultural sites and in the area for the HDO is not on an industrial complex but scattered amongst the fields. A horticultural hub needs good access roads not small country lanes with no safety features (separation for HGV’s) for ordinary people.

Please re-consider the HDO trying to add on to horticultural sites is not sound if the local roads cannot support the enterprise and expansion. The designated area should be compliant with Policy DM11 (local plan) where local roads and the impact on them is taken into account fully. The environment and local amenity should also have been included.

Yours faithfully,

Lizzie Bacon
OBSESSION to Arun District Council Ref: Local development Plan Horticultural order.

I am an old age pensioner who travels to the Barnham area to visit relatives. As I do not drive I sometimes travel from Barnham station along Lake lane. The condition of the lane and verges is terrible due to large HGV's and tractors and trailers I feel unsafe to walk to access my relative’s residential home. Due to the narrow lane the HGV’s and tractors and trailers already use the verges and pedestrian footways as extra road without regard for pedestrians. I have known Lake lane for a long time and the condition of the verges and road surface is worse than it has ever been because the verges are damaged and it can cause trips especially concerning as I am older.

I understand a horticultural development area is to be allocated around Eastergate, Barnham, Yapton, Walberton and in the fields off Lake Lane and that planning restrictions will be lifted to allow expansion. I find this notion completely unacceptable and that the order and allocated areas has been made with no thought for the impact on local amenity, local people or respect for their safety or the environment where they live.

In 2011 Arun District Council took no notice of local people and allowed planning to be lifted on a horticultural site which changed the nature of the site and increased the amount of HGV's using the lanes unsafely.

The horticultural sites have been expanded but the tiny country lanes have remained, which is why there has been so much loss of amenity and environmental damage. Lake Lane and Yapton railway crossing is dangerous because of the unsuitability of the narrow junction to withstand the excessive horticultural traffic. Planning restrictions were lifted allowing excessive HGV's to operate, despite people reporting unsafe incidents, verge damage and the hazards of HGV's grid-locking cars on Yapton Railway junction.

Before lifting horticultural planning restrictions, Arun Planners should have consulted Network Rail but they didn't which is why Lake lane and Yapton junction is still currently dangerous and chaotic as they didn't consider the infrastructure. A slip road (MS3plan) for HGV's from Yapton Lane onto Lake lane is needed as an improvement to move HGV's away from the railway junction. So both WSCC and Arun District already know Lake lane is dangerous as an HGV service road so why are they considering lifting more planning restrictions in the area when the public road (Lake Lane) is the only service road to the horticultural sites (designated areas off Lake lane) and is known to be unsafe already?

Please don't repeat the same Planning and Highway mistakes allowing expansion but not thinking about Highway capacity and local people's amenity. The narrow lanes which are public roads surrounding the areas for Horticultural development are already known to be dangerous for the elderly, cyclists and pedestrians due to narrow road dimensions.

Yours once again
The HGV's and tractors and trailers need a separate service road. I have noticed that tractors and trailers now use the lane alongside residential houses, they use to use the back field which was safer, quieter and less environmentally damaging.

Any removal of planning restrictions for the designated horticultural sites should be stopped. Stringent planning controls should remain which should include risk assessing the suitability and impact on the public roads for horticultural traffic. (past and present) publishing the results of a Highway safety audit and strict safety assessment of the lanes used by service HGV's and tractors should be undertaken and made available to the public.

I no longer feel safe using the surrounding lanes in the Barnham, Yapton and Walberton areas to visit my relatives and any additional tractors and trailers will add to the environmental damage, compromise safety and result in loss of amenity. This LDO and Horticultural Plan is flawed and shows no regard for public safety for pedestrians, cyclists and especially the elderly and young.

Arun District and WSCC need to adhere to Policy DM11 (local plan) which says: 'that vehicular access from the site to the road network is adequate and uses roads capable of accommodating vehicle movements likely to be generated by development without detriment to Highways safety.'

Yours faithfully,

R.I. Overton (Mrs)
To ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Sheet documentation enclosed A-E (to show)

Objection to Horticultural development order.

It is totally unacceptable that the proposed LDO and Horticultural Designated area would be using inadequate public roads Yaptone Lane/Lake lane to support the horticultural hub. Any further horticultural expansion would be unsustainable and unsafe and should be dismissed on known Highway safety grounds.

The enclosed documentation clearly shows WSCC Highways and ADC are fully aware that there are Highway safety problems with Lake lane/ Yaptone junction and Lake lane. The ONLY service route to designated site (Barnham/Walberton fields off lake lane) is Lake lane. In view of the fact that both WSCC Highways and ADC planning office are fully aware that there are documented Highway safety issues with Lake lane (designated HDO Barnham off Lake lane) it means the HDO (area) is unsound, unsustainable and dangerous. These serious Highways safety factors should have been taken into before the designated HDO plan was devised.

Documentation A-E

Sheet A T.Townsend WSCC Planning Laison Officer documents to S. Leeson ADC Planning department 29th August 2007 references ‘the prime concern is the possible increase in HGV movements and the impact this will have on site access, Lake lane and its junction with Yaptone Road’.

Sheet B 31st August 2007 Again WSCC to ADC refuses planning permission on ‘Highway safety grounds (Horticultural site -service road Lake lane)

Sheet C September 4th 2007 : WSCC Highways refused a planning application for a horticultural site on Lake Lane because of the potential damage to infrastructure that the proposed 680 HGV’s would cause. In short: Reason for the planning restrictions on the horticultural site was rejected on Highway safety grounds. (due to concerns about inadequate infrastructure – Lake Lane and junction)

Sheet D WSCC HGV SURVEY shows documented increase of HGV’s operating along Lake lane well over the 680+ yr of concern in 2007.

In 2011 West Sussex HGV count documented approximately 24,000 HGV movements a year along Lake Lane. Local residents present photographs and testimonies to complain of increasing hazards and environmental damage. Information noted but not acted on despite verge damage not being disputed by WSCC Highways and documentation in 2007 warning about damage to the infrastructure. SHEET 10 WEST SUSSEX INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATION 7 JUNE 2011

Sheet D2 Article shows Council planning Officer admitting an increase in HGV movements exceeding the safe number (2007) of 680 HGV movements a yr. This means the current HGV’s and tractors are operating unsafely along Lake Lane and over Yaptone Railway junction/Lake lane according to WSCC Highways – ADSC planning dept. own paper-work. Documentation shows Lake lane is already unsustainable and unsafe and in 2016 should be cause for Highway safety concern and have been taken into account before designating the HDO. (Barnham off Lake Lane) as the safety hazards are already known.

As T.Townsend predicted excessive HGV’s would compromise the infrastructure as shown 29th
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August 2007 sheet A. Grid-locking on Yapton Railway line reported (August 2011) to WSCL Highways due to overlarge HGV exiting and entering by Yapton lane and Yapton junction. Photograph taken – WSCL/ADC inaction. Phone call to HM Inspector of Railways who ordered a critical safety review – junction amended, verges removed - no safety features for pedestrians or cyclists put in place.

So both ADC and WSCL Highways are fully aware that there are current Highway safety problems at Yapton Lane and Lake lane Railway junction. Hence the requirement from the TC for SLH’s HGV’s not to cross the railway line needed because of WSCL Highways/ADC lack of regulation caused by them lifting planning conditions on Lake lane horticultural site without considering the infrastructure or consulting Network Rail.

In 2016 there are now far more vehicles on Lake lane than the rejected 680+ HGV’s a year of 2007, so why hasn’t the Highway safety of the infrastructure been taken into account if the only service roads for the proposed horticultural hub is Yapton lane/Lake junction and Lake lane?

ADC and WSCL documentation shows both ADC and WSCL Highways are fully aware that along Lake lane there are reported hazards and verge decimation (not disputed) due to HGV’s/tractors using the narrow carriageway (serious hazard for pedestrians) photographs enclosed.

In addition their own paper-work 2007 highlighted the dangers of the inadequate infrastructure along Lake lane and Yapton Lane/Lake lane railway junction. Lake lane and Yapton railway junction is now chaotic, compromised and unsafe with a TSR in place. An added requirement on SLH licence(lorry park) is not to right turn over the railway line (avoiding grid-locking). In addition an improvement plan for a slip road (at cost to the tax-payer) has been devised to move HGV’s away from Lake lane/Yapton junction because of excessive HGV’s using the unsuitable and narrow Lake lane junction. The ‘improvement’ has been made with no risk assessment of the whole of Lake lane which the HGV’s using the slip road will use to access the horticultural sites.

As shown in the documents in 2007 Highway safety along Lake lane and at Yapton Lane/Lake lane Yapton Railway crossing was a grave matter and HGV’s numbers were strictly regulated by Planning and Highways.

In 2016 it would appear that Highway safety has not been included and a LDO designated Horticultural area proposed despite known safety hazards. No Highway consultation documents on the current HGV’s/tractors and trailers operating along Yapton and Lake lane or recent safety audit transport or risk assessment of the current infrastructure has been made prior to the LDO. A strange omission as by WSCL Strategic Planning documentation 2007 the excessive HGV numbers (2011-16) would render Lake lane unsafe and unsustainable and any further planning permissions would be refused on Highway safety Grounds.

By omitting the known safety problems of Yapton lane and Lake Lane it does have the effect of making Lake lane seem safer than in reality it is. Different Highway safety criteria seem to be in applied in 2007 than 2011-16 which seems somewhat irregular - presumably different end goals are required?

Promoting horticultural expansion with no regard for public Highway safety is morally indefensible.

Please register the above comments.

Yours faithfully,
Dear Sirs,

I have read through the document and am in the process of putting-together a reply. The main 'omission' that I see so far is the lack of a Stage 1 Safety Audit, in line with WSCC policy for developments of this size. This should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity and submitted (with a Designer's Response) to me for review.

As you will know from my consultation responses back to Arun DC, the prime concern is the possible increase in HGV movements and the impact this will have on the site access, Lake Lane and its junction with Yapton Road. The SA should scrutinise these three elements of the scheme.

Tim Townsend

---

Mr Townsend,

Our clients are enquiring if you have had an opportunity to go through Halcrows report yet?

Douglas Briggs Partnership
Flint Barns
Ham Farm
Bosham
West Sussex
PO18 8EH
Susan Leeson

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 31 August 2007 11:49
To: Susan Leeson
Subject: Lake Lane Nurseries and Eric Wall Ltd

Susan,

Just to let you know that I have not yet reached agreement with either party re. their proposals.

You should, by now, have a copy of my letter to Eric Wall Ltd. (John Ameay, Architect) and I am in the process of writing a similar one to Lake Lane/Yoder Nurseries.

In the absence of information that convinces me that there will be no further HGV movements, then I must maintain reasons for refusal. I am likely to require highway improvements if they want to pursue their schemes as submitted. However, a full safety analysis/safety audit of the road network (Lake Lane and Lake Lane J/W Yapton Road) is required and any recommendations made considered for inclusion in an appropriate scheme of improvements.

Tim

[Signature]
Mr. B. Sheppard,
Halcrow Group Limited,
Vineyard House,
44 Brook Green,
London,
W6 7BY

Our ref: JDA/193.80.2

Dear Mr. Sheppard,

Proposed New Polytunnels, Yoder Nurseries, Old Lake Nurseries, Yapton.

Thank you for your Transport Statement of August 2007. In addition, I have looked carefully at appropriate policies relating to road capacity and road safety to see how the application and your statement compares with the requirements of the County Council, as Highway Authority.

Of prime concern is still the additional HGV impact on Lake Lane and its junction with Yapton Road brought about by the activities in the proposed polytunnels. Additional movements are confirmed in Appendix 'B' of your Transport Statement.

From the text of the Statement it is not made clear how the SGP operations are split or whether chrysanthemum production and/or importation would continue or cease. The data provided merely refers to Yoder Toddington and not the cumulative impact of all the operations. Although you have attempted to indicate that traffic movements would be less overall when compared to the previous SGP operations (when compared to previous activity on the site), your Appendix 'B' criticises this and indicates that for 14 weeks of the year, HGV traffic movements would increase. In fact, a traffic study carried out by WSCC on 7th August 2007 (attached) shows that a total of 32 HGVs used the site entrance on one day alone which does not compare with your Appendix 'B'.

As stated in our discussions, the key concern is the additional HGV traffic generated by the site's activities resulting in more HGV movements along Lake Lane and through the Yapton Road junction. It is commendable that drivers are requested to enter and leave via the east although I note that a 'Traffic Routing Agreement' does not appear to be in place. However, because of my concern about additional HGV activity brought about by the planned activities in the proposed polytunnels having an impact on Lake Lane, I am not satisfied that you have demonstrated that the proposal is acceptable in road safety terms on the nearby road network.
My original response to Arun District Council raised concerns about the highway network and the impact brought about by the proposed development. My recent email to you raised concern about lack of a safety appraisal (Safety Audit) of Lake Lane and its junction with Yapton Road. Clearly, the nearby highway network has deficiencies and is not suitable for HGV traffic without improvements. After close scrutiny of the lane and appropriate policies, a Road Safety Audit should be carried out of the access and local highway network (Lake Lane and its junction with Yapton Road) and any recommendations made in the Audit be considered for inclusion in additional works to the aforementioned roads. Any works would have to be appropriately related to the additional HGV activity brought about by the redevelopment of the site and would have to be carefully discussed with Arun planners as well.

With regard to travel planning, a Travel Plan will be required although it is recognised that the company is already using best endeavours to be effective in this regard. My colleague, Mr. Moulard, can advise you regarding how to take such a plan forward.

I regret that I cannot agree to your client’s development without being fully satisfied on the points raised. As such, I must maintain a highway recommendation of refusal of the application for road safety reasons.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Townsend,
Planning Liaison Officer,
Development Planning

Cc: Susan Leeson, Arun District Council
### HGV survey results from October 2010

| Ref No | Location                      | Cars and 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Climping - Church Lane</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lymington - A284</td>
<td>11188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barnham - B2233 Yapton Road</td>
<td>7654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yapton - B2233 Yapton Road</td>
<td>6586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Arundel - Ford Road</td>
<td>5812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Climping - B2233 Yapton Road</td>
<td>5797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yapton - North East Road</td>
<td>3786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yapton - Ford Lane</td>
<td>3162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Witterton - The Street</td>
<td>2117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Barnham - Barnham Lane</td>
<td>1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barnham - Lake Lane (west)</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barnham - Lake Lane (east)</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HGV survey results from two additional sites surveyed in 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>HGVs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Barnham - Lake Lane (west of Tidworth Cottage)</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ryean Road - B2233</td>
<td>7926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Comparing the data from the original 12 sites between 2008 and 2010 the total average daily flows for all locations show a slight reduction from 64,700 to 63,000 vehicles. The totals for cars and motorcycles show a slight increase from 56,580 to 57,200. The totals for Medium Goods Vehicles (MGVs) which includes 2-axle Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) and buses as well as vans and pick up trucks show a significant reduction from 7,842 to 4,911, a reduction of 37%. In contrast, the totals for HGVs show a significant increase from 455 to 852, a rise of 87%. The pattern of fewer MGVs and more HGVs is repeated at most of the sites but with the exceptions are A284, Lymington Road and Ford Road, Arundel where both MGVs and HGVs are less than 2008. Overall, however, the number of goods vehicles (both MGVs and HGVs) at all sites has reduced from 8,297 to 5,763.

2.4 There is no immediate explanation as to why the totals for MGVs and HGVs have changed so significantly. Further investigation may be needed to determine whether there have been changes in the way the survey equipment has been calibrated or whether the change is part of a wider pattern replicated across the rest of West Sussex. One explanation is that commercial vehicle operators may have chosen to use larger vehicles to improve efficiency. There have been changes in some of the local commercial operations which have generated more goods vehicle movements but the effects of these are fairly localised e.g. in Lake Lane, Barnham.
WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATION

DATE: 7 June 2011

FROM: Keith Comins
TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Mrs Susan Leeson

SUBJECT: WA/29/11 - Removal of conditions 2 & 3 of WA/70/68 (NOT in Atrium)
(packing shed and ancillary accommodation at Lake Lane Nurseries).

Lake Lane Nursery, Park Road, Walberton, West Sussex

CONSULTATION DATE: 23 May 2011

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice Objection
Modification No-Objection More Information
Refusal

TAD contribution: £

The Highway Authority has previously commented on the reasons behind the submission of planning application WA/29/11 for the removal of Conditions 2 & 3 following grant of planning permission WA/70/68. In our consultation response dated 27 April 2011, due to our general concerns that the proposed removal of the conditions may result in an intensification of vehicular activity along Lake Lane, we asked for more information detailing the number of vehicles movements arising from the current site use and how the site may operate should the conditions be removed.

The applicant’s agent has now produced information regarding the historical use/activity of vehicular traffic at the site between the periods 1997 to 2002 and information regarding current day activities and predictions for the future.

For the period 1997 to 2002, the applicant was employing in excess of 200 staff. This generated significant levels of vehicular activity with arrivals and departures occurring throughout the day. There were regular arrivals of HGVs from Holland, Turkey and Spain each day associated with the delivery of produce. Once packed with flowers, further HGVs were then distributed daily to retail outlets. There were additional deliveries of materials required in the general production line associated with the running of the nursery. It is estimated that the level of activity at the time was in the order of 100 to 150 cars, mini-buses, tractors and light vehicles a day, along with approximately 40 HGVs a day. The above resulted in a total of 280-380 two-way movements a day.

Currently, during the Spring and Summer peak periods, the applicant employs up to 100 staff. Staff arrive and depart by means of cars or mini-buses. In addition there are approximately 49 HGV deliveries to the site on a daily basis resulting in 98 two-way HGV movements. Combined with the daily transportation activity associated with staff arrivals and departures, there is a total of 218 daily two-way traffic movements.

The Applicant’s agent has confirmed that the level of current use and future use will remain the same should the conditions, the subject of this application, be removed. Comparing the level of vehicular activity associated with the current use/predicted future use, with the historical use, there

This document shows and acknowledges verge damage does not acknowledge local community interest. Neighbourhood group complaints - verge damage not disputed.
has seen a reduction in overall activity. Although it is acknowledged that since 2002 there has been a slight increase in HGV movements.

The Highway Authority acknowledges that the current level of activity along Lake Lane, does at times cause disruption and inconvenience to other users of the lane. This is supported by evidence provided by local residents in the form of photographs, video and written representations to the highway authority. The evidence of verge and edge of carriageway damage and footage of articulated vehicles taking up the majority of the carriageway space and thus requiring other highway users to use areas of verge is not in dispute. This reflects the existing situation and through the consideration of this planning application we need to assess what impact there will be on traffic movements if conditions 2 & 3 are removed.

From the information provided there is no substantive evidence to suggest that level of activity will increase over and above the current levels experienced if the above application is approved, and on that basis there would be no highway reasons of refusal that could be sustained at Appeal should the application be refused.

(Although not part of this application, the Highway Authority is aware of the possibility of an alternative access being provided to the SGP land direct from B2132, Yapton Lane. The Highway Authority would very much support the principle of such an access due to the overwhelming benefits that removing the current level of HGV movements from Lake Lane would bring to local residents in respect of improvements to their immediate amenity and to the Authority itself in terms of savings on maintenance costs on Lake Lane.)

Keith Comins
Local Development Division
has seen a reduction in overall activity. Although it is acknowledged that since 2002 there has been a slight increase in HGV movements.

The Highway Authority acknowledges that the current level of activity along Lake Lane, does at times cause disruption and inconvenience to other users of the lane. This is supported by evidence provided by local residents in the form of photographs, video and written representations to the highway authority. The evidence of verge and edge of carriageway damage and footage of articulated vehicles taking up the majority of the carriageway space and thus requiring other highway users to use areas of verge is not in dispute. This reflects the existing situation and through the consideration of this planning application we need to assess what impact there will be on traffic movements if conditions 2 & 3 are removed.
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Keith Comins
Local Development Division
One vote brings dismay as lorries get green light

by JEANNIE KNIGHT

UP to 100 lorries a day will continue to use narrow Lake Lane, Barnham, after Arun district councillors voted by a slender majority last Wednesday to allow Stuart Lyons Haulage to continue to operate from a building on the former nursery site in the area.

Residents are furious that their concerns have not been addressed and many of them will be writing or posting online their objections based on what they describe as "contentious and inaccurate statements" in the Planning Statement.

These are backed up by press reports and a seven-minute CD showing lorries in Lake Lane, BBC Radio and television interviews with local people and organisations including Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE), all most supportive of the strong case against HGV lorries and a haulage depot operating from a Lake Lane Nursery.

Resident Mrs Elizabeth Folman said after the meeting she would make a formal complaint to the council.

Mrs Folman also believes the decision, which was passed by a majority of just one vote, with two abstentions, is based on faulty facts.

"There were material inaccuracies in the facts put before the committee," she claimed.

"A few councillors made a valiant stand and couldn't have been more realistic on our behalf.

"The houses were there long before the glasshouses opened and yet the interests of the community don't seem to come into the equation."

Members of the council's development control committee decided by 7-6, with two abstentions, to back Southern Glass Produce's bid to remove two conditions which restricted the use of the building at its Lake Lane Nursery.

A few weeks ago, residents had welcomed a decision by councillors to defer a decision, looking instead at the feasibility of building a link road from the site to Yapton Lane, to avoid lorries having to use Lake Lane.

But some of the land which would have been needed for the new link was found not to be owned by Southern Glasshouse Produce.

Arun's decision has been sent to the Planning Inspectorate, which was due to decide SGP's appeal against the council's failure to determine its planning application within the legal timetable.

The council's head of development control Nikolas Antoniou said: "Hopefully, the appeals process will not have been started yet and there will not be any cost to the council because SGP will not have to go through the process of stating their case."

The company had applied to remove two conditions imposed on a building in 1989.

One restricts its use to purposes linked to crops grown at the nursery.

The other says the building should be knocked down once it stops being used for agriculture or horticulture.

The council's planning officer, Jonathan Parsons claimed at the meeting that residents' fears that the removal of the conditions would lead to even more lorries were unfounded.

But he admitted that while there had been a decrease in traffic movements from the site, there had been a slight increase in HGV movements.

County highways figures showed that 88 of the 282 two-way daily traffic movements from the nursery involved HGVs and officials admitted Lake Lane had been damaged by lorries and acknowledged there was disruption to residents' lives, but did not oppose the application.

Cllr John Charles protested at the meeting: "These conditions were put in for a good reason and there is no reason to remove them.

"Removing the conditions will allow extra traffic movements to and from the site, with possibly larger lorries, which could go down a country lane."

Fellow councillor Jean Goad insisted the conditions were still necessary and should remain.
15. I also agree with the conclusions of West Sussex County Council that the current access road to the proposed site is unsuitable, however I have also been told that at least in principle there is approval indicated to the revised access arrangements as shown in the plans presented to them. As regards other highway related issues the Council will have the opportunity to comment on these if a planning application follows.

16. Within the ambit of my jurisdiction therefore my conclusion is that I should grant the application as applied for subject to the following conditions:

a) The operating centre shall not be used unless and until the required planning permission has been granted by the relevant authority.

b) The operating centre shall not be used unless and until a new access road has been constructed and the construction and design is approved by the relevant highways authority.

c) The operating centre shall not be used for the maintenance or washing of authorised vehicles.

d) Authorised vehicles shall enter Lake Lane by turning right from Yapton Lane and exit Lake Lane by turning left into Yapton Lane so avoiding use of the Yapton level crossing.

John Baker
Deputy Traffic Commissioner.

30 September 2015
objection to agricultural development order.
Arun district council.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Having seen to myself the danger that the public are being subjected to along these bare 1km shocked and distressed that plans are being put through that will make the road even more hazardous with no apparent plan make the road safe.

Most of us who can choose not to use the road can avoid it and keep safe. But what thought has been given to the local residents? To the impact on the village?

It was my understanding that earlier plans for the land were rejected on the grounds that the road was unsafe.

Why is it appropriate now?

I'd be very grateful if you could explain.

Yours faithfully
Dear Karl

I am writing on behalf of two Horticultural businesses in Arun District (Walberton Nursery and Binsted Nursery) in response to your consultation on Horticulture LDO's.

We wish to thank Arun DC for giving this matter some serious consideration which we interpret as being intended to provide support to our local industry and trust the following points can be considered.

1. We would support the comments made by John Hall in his submission on behalf of the WSGA (including an amendment that will be forwarded to you); we have also seen your response to this and concur with your thinking on why the actual LDO's are applied to areas already occupied by horticultural businesses. Furthermore; we notied on page 3 of the consultation the following statements:

2.9 The LDO will specify the scale and nature of developments which will be permitted within the defined area. Development proposals on sites inside the LDO area which fall outside the specification, and development proposals outside the LDO area will remain subject to existing national permitted development rights and/or the development management approach of Policy HOR DM1. For such development proposals there is, however, no lessening of the Council's commitment to encourage and support the prospects of the Horticultural Sector, merely a specific scrutiny of individual proposals.

2.10 The LDO is not a planning approach that seeks to preclude horticultural development in those parts of the District outside the defined areas. It merely seeks to assist those producers operating in the existing concentrations of activity by reducing the number of existing layers of planning process for particular forms of development. Consultation with producers has, however, identified a high level of concern as to the potential adverse consequences of having land inside and outside the LDO area in relation to the pattern of land occupancy (owned and rented), the long term aspirations of landowners, and land value and market effects.

2.11 It is important to emphasise, therefore, that for existing producers and potential new producers with interest in land outside the LDO area the planning framework will be unchanged from that pertaining at the present time. For those within the LDO area, landowners will be free to make the same decisions in respect of their own investments and those proposed by tenants as at present. The LDO only seeks to facilitate those decisions where these seek new horticultural development.

We would hope that similar statements would be integral to any implementation of LDO's as they both verify the Council's commitment to the development of the local industry and protect against the issues that we have seen arise with the Horticultural Development Areas in Chichester District.
2. We would like it to be recognised that within LDO's there may still be the possibility of diversification into non-horticultural activities - such as sub-lettings to small businesses and conversion of existing agricultural buildings into holiday lets - we recognised that this will require regular planning permission, but we are concerned that this might be negatively prejudiced by them being within an LDO.

3. The LDO requires landscape planting to be based on specified species of tree and hedgerow plants. We believe this list is too exclusive. At Binsted Nursery we have hedgerow planting originally proposed by the Farm and Wildlife Advisory Group that includes species such as *Viburnum opulus, Viburnum lantana* and *Euonymus europaeus*. We believe this condition should not be positively discriminatory - it should simply state that 'species native to the district should be used'.

4. We are concerned that ultimately the process of submitting a prior-notification of development will be become a *de facto* variant of obtaining regular planning permission. In particular we are concerned with the application of conditions in Appendix C of the consultation which has the following preamble:

"(To be used where relevant to the proposed development)"

It is going to be important to understand in what contexts these conditions will be deemed relevant: because if they were routinely applied as a pre-condition for permitted development you could end up with a process that is actually more demanding than regular planning permission.

We look forward to your responses on these issues.

Kind regards

Martin

**Martin Emmett**
*Director, Binsted Nursery*
*Director, Walberton Nursery*

Binsted Nursery (Lake Lane Site),
Lake Lane, Barnham, BOGNOR REGIS,
West Sussex, PO22 0AL, UK

Binsted Nursery is a member of the Farplants Group.

Binsted Nursery is the business name of Binsted Nurseries LLP. Binsted Nurseries LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales. Partnership No. OC357607. Registered Address: c/o Spofforths, 9 Donnington Park, 85 Birdham Road, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 7AJ.

Binsted Nursery Ltd is a limited company registered in England and Wales. Company No.: 06504820. Registered Address: c/o Spofforths, 9 Donnington Park, 85 Birdham Road, Chichester, West Sussex, PO20 7AJ.
Opposition and objection to Horticultural Order

Dear Sir or Madam,

The designation of the Horticultural area (Barnham Off Lake lane has been made without any thought for local people and their amenity. Regulation on the Highway especially with regard to Highway hazards is a matter for WSCC Highways. A full safety and technical assessment should have been made of Lake lane BEFORE the designated area was chosen.

I am appalled that despite our complaints about safety, no assessments have been undertaken of Lake lane which will be the service road for all the HDO horticultural sites off Lake lane. Both ADC and WSCC Highways are fully aware that the infrastructure is compromised and should take our complaints very seriously. No updated Highway safety assessment, HGV count has been requested by your department from WSCC Highways despite ADC knowing there are already unsafe areas at the junction and along Lake lane (public road).

Members of WSCC Highways/ADC were at the Traffic Commissioners meeting when our testimony regarding nearly being killed by a reversing HGV was read out. It seems our complaints of hazards as a result of current operating HGV’s and tractors are being ignored and brushed under the carpet. Restrictions should have already been put on the road but you continue to ignore our safety. As a result we continue to experience dangerous HGV movements and tractors that use our drive-way as a lay-by because Lake Lane has become an industrial service road that is too narrow to accommodate a car and HGV safely.

I am therefore incredulous that you are thoughtlessly preparing to 'lift planning restrictions' for Walberton fields (Barnham off Lake Lane) when you are fully aware that all the horticultural service HGV’s and tractors will have to use Lake lane causing further safety hazards and damage to the environment.

It is unacceptable to dismiss verge damage as usual and acceptable in semi-rural areas alongside residential houses. Sections along Lake lane have no verge left due to over-runs because they are subject to the continual over-riding of HGV’s and tractors using a narrow service route (Lake Lane) The damage is far from cosmetic. We suffer - noise, visual disturbance, drain damage, unsafe walking paths, uneven surfaces hazards for cyclist/pedestrians and HGV’s/tractors reversing or pulling over without warning. Verge damage repair does not take place because Highway themselves have told us that there is no point as they will just keep getting damaged. WSCC Highways do not dispute the verge damage and yet the allocated HDO designated area only service road will be Lake Lane!
WSCC Highways have not given any explanation as to why they have not risk assessed these hazards. Is it because they want horticultural expansion at any cost even public safety?

ADC and WSCC have created the unsafe road conditions (Lake lane) by allowing planning permission to be lifted in 2011 without considering how the excessive HGV’s and tractors would affect the infrastructure. (Yapton Junction railway and lake lane) Permissions were lifted despite knowing Yapton Railway junction/Lake lane was already dangerous and all along the lane was damaged and hazardous. (personal testimony, residential documents given to WSCC and ADC prior to planning committee meeting)

Why have different Highway safety planning rules been applied? In 2007 Lake lane was considered unsafe for more than 680 HGV’s a yr. and planning permission for a horticultural site. Off Lake Lane was dismissed on Highway safety grounds. In 2011-16 despite 24,000 + HGV a yr. operating along Lake lane both ADC and WSCC Highway have no safety concerns about Lake Lane the service road for the designated area? It would appear local amenity, the environment and safety was considered in 2007. In 2011-16 matters of environmental damage and safety have been excluded, perhaps in a bid to aid horticultural expansion? Making the lane seem safer than it really is shows a lack of due diligence and care, and the HDO is preparing the way to put local people at risk of serious harm.

It is with disbelief that both ADC and WSCC highways have decided to create a ‘horticultural hub’ through imposing a HDO. Why has the HDO designated area been chosen without any regard for Highway safety. This is not in keeping with Policy DM11 of the local development plan. I strongly oppose this unsound order.

Yours sincerely,