

[REDACTED]

From: Richard Temple
Sent: 26 January 2018 09:49
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: Wings Nursery AL/115/17/OUT
Importance: High

Please scan as correspondence between Agent and WSCC.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 January 2018 09:45

[REDACTED]

Richard Temple; Alex Budd
Subject: FW: Wings Nursery
Importance: High

Phil,

Thank you for your email in relation to AL/115/17/OUT and sorry for not responding sooner.

I have read your email and spoken with Tim about the application and he has advised me where we currently are. I still just need to pull a few things together but I hope to have a response to you and our updated position by early next week.

I can assure you that you will get a fair hearing and the assessment of this application will be no different to any other application within the County. I have no issues or concerns with Tim assessing this application and he will continue to be the case officer on behalf of the Highway Authority.

Have a good weekend and I'm more than happy to speak once you have our updated position which, as I said before, I hope to have with you early next week.

Regards

Steven Shaw BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT

County Highways (Development Management) Team Manager

Economy, Planning, and Place Directorate

West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor, Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RH

Phone: 0330 222 4674

[REDACTED] | Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 January 2018 12:19
To: Steven Shaw

Subject: Wings Nursery
Importance: High

Dear Mr Shaw,

I write to you in reference to planning application AL/115/17/OUT for a 55 dwelling residential development and associated access on land to the west of the A29 Lidsey Road, Woodgate, West Sussex. My colleague Alex Budd has been handling this project but I now feel compelled to write to you.

WSCC highways have raised a formal objection to the development proposal on the following grounds:-

- I. Sustainability
- II. Access
- III. Highways Safety
- IV. Traffic Impact

The full highways comments are attached for reference. In essence there are two areas for objection as the four listed condense down to highway impact and sustainability. In this case, I am confident that you will agree that access, highways safety and traffic impact are all very closely inter-related.

The highway objection relates to queue lengths associated with the Lidsey Road railway crossing 220m north of the site would be increased to an extent that is deemed 'severe' in terms of both traffic impact and safety. An objection on the grounds of sustainability / accessibility has also been raised relying heavily on a previously refused site at the Woodgate Centre (ref) which dates back 6 years to 2012.

Following the initial consultation RGP prepared a Technical Note rebutting the issues raised identifying the following:-

- i. Based on the trip generation assessment, even if taking an extremely robust view of the site's trip generating potential, the extent of addition queuing would be minimal and not at all severe.
- ii. The geometries of the proposed access and Lidsey Road have been designed to safeguard against 'blocking back' on Lidsey Road. There is no pattern of accident data evidence that would support Mr Townsends opinion on blocking back. Further these issues were not raised in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.
- iii. The NPPF identifies that accessibility has to be considered relative to its context - in this particular case on the rural / urban fringe. Whilst the site would not exhibit a city centre level of accessibility, the residual cumulative impact cannot be categorised as 'severe' as sustainable transport options are available. Recent planning applications at Hook Lane AL/39/13/ (79 dwellings) and AL/8/16/OUT (14 dwellings) have near identical accessibility credentials to the proposal and have both been granted planning consent at appeal. Neither of these schemes had highway objections from WSCC.

The subsequent response to RGP's Technical Note by highways officer Mr Townsend did not acknowledge the Technical Note's contents, and his subsequent response was largely reproduction of his original comments. The lack of meaningful review and the absence of any constructive dialogue is a concern, and is unfair to our client.

Notwithstanding Mr Townsend's apparent off-hand dismissal of our Technical Note, we wish to objectively demonstrate that the impact of this proposal is in no way 'severe', which we would otherwise do so at appeal. We wish to do this through traffic modelling of the A29 / railway junction. This would leave sustainability matters, which WSCC would need to defend against several examples of permitted residential development in the location - our additional work would focus on comparisons.

May I have your assurance that if we undertake this work now, rather than in preparation for a planning appeal, the additional assessment would be objectively viewed and commented on, and not by Mr Townsend? In order to undertake this work we need the support of WSCC to afford our client's application an extension of time.

The scheme has over whelming support from the local community and has been identified in the neighbourhood plan. The highways refusal from Mr Townsend is the only outstanding matter and I am confident this issue can be resolved.

I'm happy to discuss this matter with you at your officer or at RGP's south coast office if you would like more clarity on the matter.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Regards,

Philip Russell
Managing Director



W. www.rgp.co.uk



Transport Planning and Infrastructure Design Consultants

RGP is a trading name of Russell Giles Partnership Limited. Registered in England No. 4207910

This Email is confidential and is for the intended recipient only. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the author and do not disclose or use the contents in any way. The author bears no responsibility for any legal action or disputes arising from views or professional advice expressed which do not relate to the business of Russell Giles Partnership Limited.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.