

Comments on Revised Plan for Development of Land next to Ford Road

Planning ref: AB/135/20/OUT

from Alison Wilkinson, 28 Dalloway Road, Arundel, BN18 9HW

Design and Access Statement – Addendum Responding to Section 2 of the Arun Design Guide SPD

F.01 Creating a network of Streets, Footpaths, Cycleways & Access

A key objective of the movement framework is to create a clear hierarchy of streets within the development and ensure the area and its surroundings are easily accessed by foot and cycle. This can only be done by balancing the movement hierarchy and avoiding a car led development.

Comment: We all know we want to move towards a less car led society but the reality is that this will take many years so, whilst the aspirations of this proposal are laudable, the reality is that everyone who buys one of these properties will have a least one car and probably two or more.

The layout will provide easy access to nearby bus stops and existing Arundel C of E Primary School.

Comment: The nearby bus stops have a limited service, especially for secondary school children.

A nursery building will eventually be built on site too.

This introduction of an on-site nursery is just ticking a box and is unlikely to be built unless it is included in the development plans from the beginning.

Additional comment: *This building is referred to as a Community Centre on the illustrative master plan so which is it a nursery or community centre? The outline plan has no allocated parking facilities for such an enterprise so again, with their restricted parking plans for the development proper, anyone using these facilities will park in the surrounding streets, which are already packed full of cars from the residents due to their own limited parking facilities.*

G.01 Neighbourhoods, Centres and Local Facilities

Within 5 minutes of the bus stops on Ford Road and 20 minutes of higher order facilities such as the town centre and bus access to Secondary level education in Littlehampton.

Comment: As per my comment for F.01 this bus service is intermittent and non-existent for children needing to get to school in anywhere other than Littlehampton.

G.02 Density and uses

A nursery will eventually be provided on site. All other facilities are within walking distance.

Comment: See my comment on F.01 about this woolly statement which, unless it is part of any planning approval, is never likely to see the light of day.

I.01 Car Parking

Comment on detailed parking plans table in document: *This part of the proposal is ludicrous. Most of these houses will have a minimum of two cars and there will undoubtedly be work vans to accommodate too. Whilst aesthetically the houses fronting the green will look wonderful they will have nowhere to park thus occupying the small number of road spaces allocated as 'visitor spaces' on the development. This will mean them spilling out onto the surrounding streets, none of which are wide enough to accommodate permanent parking without compromising emergency services access.*



Comment: They have the map showing Dalloway Road where Torton Hill should be. Error 1.

Page 15 2.1 Site Description

Access to the site could be achieved at a number of locations including High Ridge Close, Stewards Rise, Priory Lane and Dalloway Road

Comment: This is another troubling part of this document as it gives carte blanche for anyone to access the site from anywhere. There needs to be a caveat stating these access points are for foot and cycle access only. Also, there is no mention in the document about the suggested Emergency Vehicle only access in Dalloway Road having collapsible bollard's to prevent general use, especially by motorbikes?

2.2 Location and Access

Bus

There is a nearby bus service known as the Arundel Community Bus which runs through the residential streets of Tortington and links the area to Arundel town centre.

Comment: The community bus cease operating in 2019

The number 9 bus links Andover to Littlehampton, Worthing, Shoreham by sea and runs along Canada Road

The number 9 bus runs from Arundel not Andover – Error 2.

Page 16 2.3 Site photographs

View 8 Western portion of Priory Lane

Comment: This clearly shows the unsuitability of such a narrow road for accommodating the excessive amounts of traffic that will occur from people living on the new development cutting through from Chichester to the Ford Road from the A27. This road, during heavy rainfall, is almost impassable and is of single vehicle width. Video and photographs of the road following moderate rain fall are available should further confirmation to support the unsuitability of this road be needed.

View 12 View along Birch Close

Comment: Why has this been included in this collage of photographs? It is nowhere near the site so does this mean that additional access is being considered from this dead end, which backs onto Priory Lane?

Page 27 Plan Opportunity to create new hedge row.

Comment: This planting has already been done on Priory Lane and in front of the houses bordering Dalloway Road. Why is this the case when it is stated as part of the planning proposal?

Page 39 - 10.

The proposal does not identify land for a community building, so it does not comply with Policy AR2©: the layout plan should identify land to safeguard in accordance with this policy.

Comment: See comments on F.01 and G.02. This building has now been included to appease the Council's requirements but with no thought as to how to accommodate any additional parking this may promote. Also, as previously mentioned, clarify is needed as to whether it is a nursery or community centre?

Page 40 6.1 Key master plan focus

5.1.1 Denser development will be around the village green, where car free frontages will overlook the focal space.

Comment: See comment I.01. There is insufficient parking allocation for family houses.

5.1.4 Land for Nursery/Community Building

Land for a nursery school will benefit both the new residents and the existing local community.

Comment: See previous comments in F.01 and G.02 and page 39 – 10. Unless this is part of any planning application from the beginning it will never materialise. Also, no consideration has been given as to where any children from a nursery would continue to primary school, both of which are currently full with limited extension capacity. Also, to reiterate the concerns that no parking facilities have been included in this proposal.

Page 45 7.2 Key Spaces

8. Allotments – Food growing facilities provide a place for social interaction as well as benefitting the community with fresh produce.

Comment. The revised illustrative master plan now shows not only a community centre but community allotments next to the Priory Road entrance. Does this mean the existing allotments are to be sucked up into the new development or is this in addition to them?

10 Access and Parking

10.2 Site Accessibility

Internal site layout will be highly permeable to promote travel by non-car modes, whilst improvements to public transport accessibility will be required through provision of bus stop infrastructure and enhancing bus routes that pass in the vicinity of the site, most likely through extension/diversion of an existing service. A bus connecting to nearby rail stations would reduce reliance on the car in accessing the wider area.

Comment: Had they studied fully the current transport infrastructure they would have seen that there is currently no bus route that could be diverted. No bus uses the Ford Road south of the junction with the town end of Priory Road and nothing goes toward Ford Station, which is where many of the young people access the train to the schools in the area. This is therefore a completely unrealistic comment as a new route would need to be set up and with reduced numbers, generally, using the buses it is unlikely any company would want to take it on for just 90 houses?

10.3 Parking

Parking standards are to be determined using the Arun Parking Standards SPD. They state that parking provision should be sufficient to accommodate demand but to exploit the demand for sustainable travel. Levels of vehicle ownership will depend on the sizes and types of dwelling provided.

Comment: See comment in F.01 and I.01. These are family homes with potentially two parents and two or three grown up children who could all have cars. Even two people homes are likely to have two cars or a car and a van or a car and a campervan or 4 cars a van and a campervan. This all needs to be addressed.

Final comments

This development should not be considered for planning approval. The number of houses proposed will not be served adequately from the current facilities in the Town of Arundel and will be catastrophic for the wider immediate community with the inevitable increased additional parking that will be sought by the new home owners. The increased traffic on Ford Road and Priory Lane would create increased noise pollution and danger on an already dangerously busy road. The inclusion of the current bus service as being a viable option for the development to transport their children to school is completely unrealistic and the idea of creating a new bus route is just not viable. Therefore everyone will use their cars.

The inclusion of a nursery cum community centre appeases the current regulations on new developments but does not alleviate the problems the residents will face when trying to find a place in either of the primary schools, who are already full and whatever the designated use the lack of parking will further exacerbate both users and locals.

Another great concern is the lack of provision for increasing the capacity of an already over stretched medical practice and the impact a minimum of 180 new residents will put on their resources.

Arundel is a small rural Town that is already at capacity of what its limited resources can cope with so this proposed development, and the additional area of land behind it that has now been highlighted on one of the application plans and belongs to the Norfolk Estate, will undoubtedly be put forward for planning permission should this current application be successful.

*Finally, I noticed the **The National Planning Policy Framework** say that "the priority for development should be previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings." As there are currently a great number of these in Arundel, which were highlighted before the Town Plan was updated, surely these should be developed first before encroaching on our green space?*

I therefore urge the Planning Department to throw out this application.