**Appendix D small sample of Objector comments from applications covering the areas identified in the main document**

* + Comment: This site is clearly outside of the adopted SPA and as such should not be considered as a suitable location for permanent residential use. I use the word "permanent" deliberately as although the application refers to the main dwelling as a "mobile home", at approximately 90 sq.m,. as scaled from the plan, this represents a substantial dwelling that, coupled with further 20 sq.m. for the unitility block is no more mobile than a small bungalow would be. Any planning consideration should therefore be made as if this were a permanent dwelling rather than a mobile home. Would such an application be agreed? Additionally, the Application is a little vague in terms of how many residential units are being applied for. The Application Form refers to the creation of one residential unit of 3 bedrooms yet is described as "caravans" plural, the Design and Access Statement discusses the gypsy/traveller status and personal circumstances of two families; the applicant, Wickens and another family Wickham. If this appeal is to be considered clarity/restrictions should be sought regarding the number and frequency of other transient residences this change of use would entail as this would have a material impact on this sensitive area of the village and surrounding countryside both in terms of vehicle movements and waste management and sewerage arrangements.
	+ The proposed site adjoins Westbourne recreation ground, playground and playing fields. This is arguably the most important and widely used local amenity site in Westbourne. It is commonly and often used by dog walkers, picnickers, families with children and latterly people using the recently installed gym equipment. Local planning authorities must have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Local authorities have a duty to encourage healthy, active lifestyles, and development adjoining this important local amenity will only dissuade local people from using it. The sites current use as paddock and stabling is acceptable and in keeping with the rural aspect. The proposed site is situated outside of the defined settlement policy boundary within the designated rural area and the Emsworth to Westbourne Strategic Gap. The proposed site is on green belt land. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states that plan-making and decision-taking should protect green belt from inappropriate development. Planning policy for traveller sites also states; Policy E: Traveller sites in Green Belt - Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved, except in very special circumstances. Traveller sites (temporary or permanent) in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. The proposed site is outside the settlement area of Westbourne. The modest nature of the village has been highlighted by the fact that under the Westbourne Parish Neighbourhood Plan, currently in development, it is only required to provide 25 new homes by 2029. This application is premature and will compromise the site allocation process. Contrary to the proposals design and access statement, once outside the Westbourne settlement area, there is no roadside development. Westbourne has had 18 additional gypsy/traveller pitches allocated in the parish within the last few months and it would be disproportionate to expect one parish to accept an increasing percentage of such sites in order to accommodate the Chichester District shortfall in numbers. The cumulative effect of this proposal and recent permissions granted for gypsy and traveller sites elsewhere in Westbourne Parish will place an unreasonable burden on the local infrastructure, particularly on already overstretched education and medical facilities.
	+ Comment:This application states that there are existing buildings on the site. The application refers to the road frontage site area on which there are no buildings and to the best of local knowledge a residential caravan is also not in current existence. The drainage of Westbourne is already at full capacity and currently often overloaded with sewerage leaking on to the streets. Any further building permissions must be preceded by a capacity expansion to drainage. The application is outside the current village boundary and is a further expansion into the National Park area which should not be permitted for residential use. There is in this comment, no objection to the use for stables or grazing. Its current use.
* Comment: This proposed Gypsy site at Hopedene will further disrupt and damage the surroundings of Jubilee wood, which has been deliberately utilised for personal and private gain over the last decade. This was once a lovely site and an area where local residences could ride their horses, walk their dogs or simple stroll through The Bridle lane and other public footpaths and onward to the national park. NOW the land owners have no regard for tranquil countryside and they seem determined to profit from a change in legislation and human rights. And on top of this there is the damage to the boundary of the national park. Locally Westhampnett has had approval for such a site and this is on top of the already five traveller plots at Hopedene and the various other sites in West Ashling and other local locations. This is also on top of the large building applications taking place along Broad Rd and other various plots in Hambrook, Chidham, Southbourne and Westbourne. Which if CDC dont seriously take action to reject these building application, Chichester will be part of Havant and south of the M27 will be a housing estate within ten years with very few fields. Putting a Gypsy site at Hopedene is certainly not welcome by myself and the residence I have spoken to, most of which are now extremely anxious and upset about this situation. It will put pressure on the schools, doctors and other primary care organisations. I believe the utilities sectors for the area are already over stretched, specifically the lack of headroom at Thornham Waste Water Treatment works. CDC I urge you to act sensibly on this proposal, listen to the residence and respect the parish we reside in. Because a private land owner has offered you a site for dwellings, which will support your quotas to central government doesnt make it right, especially when the land owner is trying to profiteer from this action without any consideration for the residence or countryside.
* There is a great health and safety issue in that the Council have already passed plans for the Marlpit Quarry for proposed restoration of Hambrook Marl Pit and agricultural improvement scheme using imported inert materials and on-site derived materials. This will involve several lorries per day 6 days a week using the proposed new access road from Common Road which runs directly adjoining the proposed gypsey site. Several lorries per day accessing from the same road that the proposed plan will be sited is not only highly dangerous, especially as there will be 12 families there with at least 24 children, but breaches the Governments policy paragraph 11 of the CLG Document as highlighted by Phil Rowe planning Consultant for this application, that local planning authorities ensure that the sites are sustainable, economically and environmentally. This is on the border of the National Park and together with the Marlpit Quarry plans already granted pose environmental issues. The proposed site too far from local amenities to sustain a gypsy site. There is no local transport and local health services/GP surgeries are at their capacity again contravening paragraph 11 of the CLG "promote in collaboration with commissioners of health services, access to health services" As pointed out by Phil Rowe's application. There are no secondary schools within the area, again, contravening paragraph 11 of CLG "Ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis". The build up of traffic from lorries and vehicles to the Marlpit, plus all the vehicles of the residents of the proposed application will cause a grid lock a the top of Marlpit Lane and onto Common Road. This will put undue pressure on the locals of the area commuting to work and will make journey times much longer thus again contravening again paragraph 11 of the CLG of "promoting peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community" The application repeatedly states that CDC have neglected in meeting the Government guideline quota for Gypsy Camps within the Chichester District. However, the locality of this proposed application is only 1 mile east of Cemetery Lane Travellers site and 1 mile west of the Scant Lane Travellers Site. There are also small camps in Southbourne and Clearwater and a Council run site has been granted at Westhampnet to offer a more sustainable and professionally run base for Travellers needs. I believe that the Council could identify a more appropriate site that would be far more beneficial to the Travellers needs in this instance within the District. Woodmancote/Funtington/E &W Ashling/Westbourne/Southbourne and Hambrook are already at capacity for sustainability of such sites. Paragraph 11 of the CLG also states "provide for proper consideration of the effect of the local environmental quality (such as noise and air quality) on the health and well being of any travellers". With the permitted improvement scheme of the Marlpit Quarry and the on site concrete crusher and lorries, the air quality from dust and fumes will be severely compromised. The proposed site for the gypsy settlement is in close proximity to the Quarry and directly in the path of the prevailing wind therefore dust and noise will be overwhelming and a serious respiratory health hazard for the travellers and their children. The settlement is outside the settlement policy area These are my objections but I reserve the right to comment further and take the advice of a planning consultant after the deadline of 27th December 2013 and once the planning consultants offices resume business in the New Year.
* CDC have, I believe, now granted a PERMANENT site permission to travellers .......at Westhampnett. Thus, there is no need for a small vulnerable and amateurly run, commercial site in an out of the way position? We have at least five travellers’ sites within a two-mile radius of our house. Why should we have more? Travellers should not have permanent sites as being "Travellers" they do not reside in one place. Hambrook area seems to be targeted with hundreds of new homes being proposed. Why are we being targeted? The marl pit quarry is now approved for use as a landfill. Also, a plan for an incinerator. Combine this with a travellers site we will have all this in our back garden. If you allow another twelve plots what will stop the whole site becoming a massive travellers’ encampment? The site has a dangerous entry and exit on to common road. Utilities are non-existent. Health and safety issues with the proposed land fill at Marl Pit. This is on the border of the National Park and together with the Marlpit Quarry plans already granted pose environmental issues. The proposed site too far from local amenities to sustain a gypsy site. There is no local transport and local health services/GP surgeries are at their capacity again contravening paragraph 11 of the CLG "promote in collaboration with commissioners of health services, access to health services" As pointed out by Phil Rowe's application. There are no secondary schools within the area, again, contravening paragraph 11 of CLG "Ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis". The increased volume of traffic to the Marlpit, plus all the vehicles of the residents of the proposed application will cause massive problems onto Common Road. This will put undue pressure on the locals commuting to work, contravening again paragraph 11 of the CLG of "promoting peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community" again as pointed out in Phil Rowe's application. Paragraph 11 of the CLG also states "provide for proper consideration of the effect of the local environmental quality (such as noise and air quality) on the health and wellbeing of any travellers". With the permitted improvement scheme of the Marlpit Quarry and the onsite concrete crusher and lorries, the air quality from dust and fumes will be severely compromised. The proposed site for the gypsy settlement is in close proximity to the Quarry and directly in the path of the prevailing wind therefore dust and noise will be overwhelming and a serious respiratory health hazard for the travellers and their children. These are my objections by I reserve the right to comment further and take the advice of a planning consultant after the deadline of 27th December 2013 and once the planning consultants offices resume business in the New Year.
* Comment: I object to this application on the grounds that I believe that it is completely unsuitable for this area. There are currently many sites for travellers/ gypsies within a few miles of this proposed site and I believe currently there are many applications going through the system for extending and changing these areas. This proposed area is right on the edge of the South Downs National Park boundary and the development is not in keeping with the area. The planning regulations with in the National Park are extremely strict and as this is so close, a matter of a few 100 metres, I believe the same strict rules should apply here. If this application is granted it will change the whole character of this rural area therefore should not be allowed.
	+ Comment: I would like to object to the above application, on the following grounds: The application states 4 pitches / 12 mobile homes, but the fine print means there are actually 3 mobile homes and 3 specialist / touring caravans per pitch, with resultant vehicles and fairground rides during winter months. In addition, plans have been submitted for amenity blocks which do not appear on site plan submitted. The location plan shown separates the industrial area of the site from the proposed residential area, but there is no provision within the plan for traffic from the industrial area to enter / depart the site, other than via the residential area proposed, which will result in further breakdown of the entrance way that currently has to be negotiated to access the remainder of Cemetery Lane. The photographs shown on the design and access document, purporting to show views within and around the site do not include any images of Cemetery Lane itself, so do not show the current state of the road or the number / depth of the potholes currently situated at the entrance to the site. Noise from concrete crushing equipment already disturbs the peace of the rural area, additional noise from treatment of rides would be excessive. In addition, the size of the lorries that will be entering and leaving the site, along with the noise and exhaust fumes that such will produce, along with the same from their maintenance, would have a huge effect on visitors to the cemetery, as well as those using Cemetery Lane itself. The articulated lorries necessary for transporting a large number of fairground rides are not suitable for the small country lane in and around Woodmancote and Westbourne, and would cause especial disruption to people attending gravesides o funerals at the cemetery. In addition, the current entrance to the site in question is not large enough to accommodate such vehicles, but there is no scope to enlarge it included within the plan submitted. Local residents, visitors to the cemetery, and dog walkers already suffer from a lack of footpath and large potholes on Cemetery Lane, and additional traffic on the road would make it even more difficult to use the road. Cemetery Lane is an unadopted road, maintained by the residents and Woodmancote Contractors, who maintain the road as best they can, but the addition of more large vehicles would make this an unwarranted burden on their resources. The additional traffic on Foxbury Lane and the surrounding areas would also have a detrimental effect on the residents of Woodmancote and Westbourne. Although the application clearly states that travelling showpersons will be away for the site for extended periods from Spring to Autumn, this means that the additional traffic will be at its greatest during the wet winter months, when the roads are most likely to suffer from additional use. The site has recently had a planning refused for a similar application (Application No. WE/14/03139/FUL), for 5 plots. Some of the same reasons still stand for refusing this application: the intensification of the use of Cemetery Lane, above the level of use and activity already associated with the existing range of users, which would be detrimental to the setting and experience of the cemetery. The impacts, including activity and traffic, noise, light and disturbance, are likely to be harmful to the quality of people's experience which at present is one of quiet serenity befitting a place of rest and reflection. In summary, this application will remove the rural nature of Cemetery Lane and this part of Woodmancote for ever, and the volume of caravans exceeds previous applications, and therefore the reasons for not allowing this application have already been stated
	+ Comment: I believe this application actually creates more of an impact than previous applications and I therefore object on the following grounds; 1. This is a substantial development in a designated rural area, therefore I believe it contravenes Policy in that it would have a severe and detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the rural setting. 2. It would be an undesirable extension of urban development into a designated rural area. Urban sprawl into the green space separating the existing dwellings from the neighbouring villages of Westbourne and Woodmancote 3. The development would do harm to the setting detracting from its local environmental setting in the landscape. (Green Fields, Agricultural and equestrian land as well as the Cemetery. 4. In relation to highway issues this would bring additional traffic not only to Cemetery Lane but the narrow Lanes into and through Westbourne which is often grid locked. No doubt the encampment and its users would be likely to have Vans and such larger vehicles for moving equipment as well as the touring caravans. 5. Cemetery Lane is an un-adopted highway therefore the maintenance and upkeep falls upon the residents, as occupants of this site would not be permanent then ability or desire for them to contribute would be almost nil. The actual Lane is not really suitable for additional traffic particularly caravans and lorries. Duffield Lane to the South East is a private road but no doubt the occupants would start using this Lane for access egress, of which the surface is not suitable for heavy use. 6. Local amenities are full including schools and Doctors surgeries, put under additional strain of the large housing development across the border in Hampshire. 7. There have been several refusals of planning permission previously in the area including this site in the recent past. It appears the applicant is trying to extend the existing encampment which is I believe already for traveling showmen. 8. The waste water is shown as discharging to the mains sewer. The application for a small housing development at the junction of Cemetery Lane and Foxbury Lane identified the sewage system was incapable of taking anymore waste. Therefore, it stands to reason as this discharge is into the same sewer that it wouldn't be able to cope with the additional waste. This application was refused. 9. There has been a recent approval for a site of similar nature at Marlpit Lane not to far away, although the site has been made ready it is not being utilised indicating there is sufficient provision already for such development. 10. As well as the 12 static caravans there is also provision for 8 mobile caravans and 4 'specialist caravans, and I assume room for at least 16 other vehicles. This is not immediately obvious in the application and is a vast increase in traffic on the surrounding Lanes. Difficult to disguise in a designated rural and green setting.
* Comment: I do not think that the lane can cope with more traffic, the lane is in a very poor condition and it would be made even worse by accepting this application for more residents. I Think it would be a real shame to grant permission for more caravan pitches, taking away from Cemetery lanes rural setting. Many of the residents already living in the lane chose the area for its beautiful surroundings including myself. I do not believe granting permission will add anything to the village or community only impact it badly
* Comment: Westbourne & Southbourne Joint Burial Committee is made up of councillors from the two parishes of Westbourne & Southbourne who jointly administer the cemetery. The councillors object to this application. The cemetery is of heritage importance as supported by Dr Wightman at the appeal inquiry into application WE/12/04779/FUL. The cumulative dominating effect of gypsy/traveller accommodation in the vicinity is detrimental to the character of the area and to the setting of the cemetery
* Comment: The land west of Harwood, Cemetery Lane, is unsuitable for the stationing of residential caravans and for ancillary buildings and hardstanding. This land is part of the green-field gap between Westbourne and Woodmancote - it should be used for agriculture or horticulture or for growing trees. Using green fields for residential purposes is unsustainable. It is important, too, to keep a clear green space between the 2 communities, so that they can keep their separate identities. Cemetery Lane is an unmade road at this point and is easily damaged by heavy traffic. Access from the west would either be through the centre of Westbourne, which is frequently congested with the sheer volume of traffic nowadays, or down Foxbury Lane and/or Woodmancote Lane, both of which are narrow for a good part of their length. Access from the east/north would be along Cemetery Lane or along Cemetery Lane and Duffield Lane - these narrow lanes are un-adopted, unmade roads, and in wet winters deep potholes develop. The residents along these lanes take responsibility for paying for maintenance and/or put time and effort into looking after the lanes. Extra heavy traffic would damage the lanes and the public footpaths at the side of the lanes. There are more suitable sites for such a development in the area - both in terms of re-using brownfield sites and in terms of access.
* Comment: I object to this application on the following grounds: It is my understanding that this site is actually a greenfield site. The proposal will compromise the rural landscape which is close to the SDNP and Westbourne Cemetery - an acknowledged local historic asset The cumulative effect of this proposal, together with a similar proposal on an adjoining site, and recent permissions granted for gypsy and traveller sites elsewhere in Westbourne Parish will place an unreasonable burden on the local infrastructure, particularly on education and medical facilities Cemetery Lane does not offer safe and convenient vehicular access. The application is likely to have an unacceptable level of impact on neighbouring residents from an acoustic and visual perspective Westbourne Parish is currently developing a Neighbourhood Plan which will seek to allocate sites for different forms of development. This application is premature and will compromise the site allocation process.