

[REDACTED]

From: Karl Roberts <Karl.Roberts@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 December 2019 16:47
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: A/100/19/PL - Arundel Acre - response to WSCC

From: Ian Hayward <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 19 December 2019 08:35
To: Joney Ramirez <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Karl Roberts <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: A/100/19/PL - Arundel Acre - response to WSCC

Morning Joney,

I believe I have already provided comments to the LPA on these points please see a copy and paste below from the email I had sent on the 6th December. If there is anything additional I have not addressed please do let me know,

Kind Regards

Ian Hayward

In response to the email below:

Visibility North & Highways England:

As previously advised, I would note that from Highways England are requesting that visibility splays be provided (via condition) to the north and around the bend using DMRB methods. You may want to be aware that depending on how Highways England interpret DMRB guidance, and if they apply any departures from standards, these splays will be greater than the 25 metres that have been demonstrated in this direction to date. The 25 metre splays have been formulated using the Manual for Streets Stopping Sight Distance Calculation Coefficient.


WSCC (LHA)

- i) The submitted trip information for the existing use establishes the use is not generating a significant quantity of vehicular activity. This has been stated as being in the order of 20 trips per year in association with the use as a showpeople's yard / storage of fairground rides and trailers. The Local Highways Authority accepts that this is a reasonable number of trips for such a use and is satisfied that this number of trips can be used when estimating the showpeople's yard trip element of the proposed use. However when establishing the baseline position it is advised to take into consideration the permitted use of the site which has been established, and stated in previous planning application, as an agricultural smallholding and not one of a showpeople's yard.
- ii) The Local Highways Authority accepts that subsequently additional plans submitted represent the site and surrounding road network accurately. However is minded to view that the submitted block plan (unnamed but dated 03/07/2017) does not represent the surrounding highway network accurately, particularly the junction with A27.
- iii) As per point (i), the Local Highways Authority accepts that the showpeople's yard trip element will likely remain as per the submitted information, circa 20 trips per year. With regard to intensification of use the proposed residential element is anticipate to generate between 6-8 vehicular movements per plot per day. This would be considered a material increase over the base line position of an agricultural smallholding, or indeed the showpeople's yard / storage of fairground rides and trailers use, which has been established as generating 20 trips per year. While the existing traffic flow volumes on Arundel Road are a consideration, the primary consideration is to establish any intensification of the access point itself and then establish if the access in terms of visibility and geometry is safe and suitable for the increased use.

Broadly speaking, traffic flows on Arundel Road range between 50 – 150 movements per hour during the peak and inter peak periods. Only northbound flow data has been submitted with this application, but presumably, the southbound flows would be of a similar quantity. Given the trip generation proposed it is not unreasonable to come to the conclusion that vehicle accessing and egressing the site will at times have to give way and take into consideration these Arundel Road traffic flows.

While flows on Arundel Road may be low in comparison, this is more a question of highway capacity, which the Local Highways Authority has never raised as a concern.

- iv) Noted, the Local Planning Authority advised to ensure this is the case. Scaling of the currently submitted red edge Location Plan makes this difficult to determine. For clarity highlighted below is the area that the Local Highways Authority had previously queried as potentially being 3rd party land but required to formulate the visibility splays.



- v) The statement made in Paragraph 10.5.9 of Manual for Streets 2 (attached below) references a research study. This study was undertaken using a series of high-risk, urban, established priority junctions, of which the application site access is not. It is therefore questionable how applicable this paragraph is in this particular case. The research was also undertaken using a 2.4 metre 'X' distance for which only the demonstrated 25.5 metre splay would be considered applicable for comparison. While there is no local, evidence to the contrary, accident data etc., there would not be expected to be any given the low trip generation the access has yielded with its current use.

10.5.9 The Y distance should be based on the recommended SSD values. However, based on the research referred to above, unless there is local evidence to the contrary, a reduction in visibility below recommended levels will not necessarily lead to a significant problem.

Paragraph 109 of the NPPF states that Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. It has been established at appeal decisions that there is a division between an unacceptable impact in highway safety and a severe residual cumulative impacts. As such the 'severity test' does not apply in terms of highway safety.

For these reason described above and within formal highways consultations, the Local Highways Authority would maintain its objection to this proposal.

Ian Hayward | Data & Information Officer | Information Management | Planning Services
West Sussex County Council
 Location: Ground Floor, Northleigh, Chichester, PO19 1RH

From: Joney Ramire
Sent: 18 December 2019 17:02
To: Ian Hayward
Cc: 'Karl Roberts'; nic burrell

Subject: FW: A/100/19/PL - Arundel Acre - response to WSCC
Importance: High

Dear Ian,

I understand you have provided a response for the application at Arundel Acre ref. A/100/19/PL on behalf of WSCC. Would you be so kind to review our response below and let me know of your views at your earliest convenience? I am available over the phone all afternoon tomorrow and all day on Friday should you prefer to talk.

Under the response provided on 02/12/2019 WSCC raises an objection to the development, and we would like to respond as follows (the main issues in bold, our response addressing each point):

i. **No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate the existing use has generated a significant number of vehicular trips in recent years** – Paragraph 4.13 of Appendix D submitted with the application shows a record of vehicular activity for the site during 2017, with a maximum of 20 vehicular trips generated during the year, and no trips generated between January – April resulting from the use of the site as storage of fairground rides /trailers in connection with the applicant's business. There has been no significant change on the use of the site over 2018 & 2019 and there is no evidence to indicate there will be a significant change on the number of vehicular trips to be generated by the storage of fairground rides /trailers in connection with the proposed use of the site as a showpeople's yard. As such, the baseline to take into account when assessing whether the proposed development would generate a significant number of vehicular trips should be based on this information.

ii. **The block plan is not representative of the road layout and the deceleration lane would result in higher speeds approaching the access point** – Submitted drawing No. JNY10317/01a is based on OS mapping and accurately shows the road layout. Although lane delimitation is not shown, the submitted ATC, plans and supporting documents provide, in our view, an appropriate level of detail to allow the LHA to assess the proposal, with the ATC providing specific detail regarding speeds.

iii. **The LHA concludes the proposal will result in a material intensification of use at the existing access** – building on the information provided on point i) above, it has been shown that the vehicular movements of trailers in and out of the site are, and will continue to be, minimal throughout the year. The LHA has accepted that 26-48 two way movements per day will result from the residential element of the proposal, which will therefore be the increase on use of the vehicular access of the site. The total number of two-way vehicle movements on Arundel Road, taken from the most recent ATC survey range between 1408 and 2011, depending on day of the week. The average over 7 days is 1806. The impact from the residential units can be measured against the background traffic flows. These range between 3.4% and 2.4% increase in two way vehicle movements depending on the day of the week. The average increase is 2.7% over 7 days. **Such increase is negligible** and therefore we are of the view that **the proposal will not result in a material intensification of use** at the access.

iv. **It is acknowledged an improvement over the existing situation; however it appears the southern splay will require the use of 3rd party land** – We welcome the LHA's acknowledgement that the proposed relocation of the access will represent an improvement compared to existing and, in order to provide clarification, the proposed splays **will not** require the use of 3rd party land.

v. **The southern splay is significantly short of what would be expected given the approaching road speed, with MfS requiring a stopping sight distance (SSD) of 50m** – The southern visibility splay would be able to achieve SSD between 25.5m – 30.1m and given other site's constraints, this would be the maximum achievable on site. It is the case that Paragraph 10.5.9 from Manual for Streets 2 indicates that, although the 'Y' distance of a visibility splay should be based on the recommended SSD, *"unless there is local evidence to the contrary, a reduction in visibility below recommended levels will not necessarily lead to a significant problem."* Taking into consideration: i) the number of two-way vehicular trips which will result from trailers or large vehicles will be less than 0.1 per day; ii) the nature of this part of the road, where there exist residential accesses with limited visibility which are similar in scale and nature to the proposed residential movements to be generated from the proposal, as well as the

existence of a caravan park to the south of the site which possibly generates a higher number of larger vehicles coming in and out of the site and iii) the lack of parking restrictions on the road, essentially meaning that vehicles are capable of parking on the road thus potentially reducing vehicle speeds; we are of the view that local circumstances clearly exist to conclude that a reduction in visibility below the recommended level will not lead to a significant problem.

Based on the information provided above we are of the opinion that there would be **no material intensification of the access**. Subject to appropriately worded planning conditions and based on **local circumstances** the proposed splays will adequately address visibility in both directions and therefore the proposal **will not lead to severe harm** to the highway, in line with the requirements of Paragraph 109 of the NPPF.

Taking into account the identified need for showpeople's yard within Arun DC and the significant benefit of the proposal on this respect, the sustainable location of the proposal, the lack of impact upon neighbouring amenity, the limited impact upon visual amenity and the minimal impact upon the local highway, the benefits of the proposal significantly outweigh any potential harm thus the proposal would be in line with planning policy and other material considerations.

We would appreciate if you can take the above comments into consideration and provide an updated response on the points raised.

Many thanks,

Joney

Mrs Joney Ramirez MRTPI
Senior Planner
RPS | Consulting UK & Ireland



This e-mail message and any attached file is the property of the sender and is sent in confidence to the addressee only.

Internet communications are not secure and RPS is not responsible for their abuse by third parties, any alteration or corruption in transmission or for any loss or damage caused by a virus or by any other means.

RPS Group Plc, company number: 208 7786 (England). Registered office: 20 Western Avenue Milton Park Abingdon Oxfordshire OX14 4SH.

RPS Group Plc web link: <http://www.rpsgroup.com>

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.