

A/109/20/RES – Construction Traffic Access via the High Street

APC share the LPA's concerns about the narrowness of the shared carriageway and potential conflict between the current users and contractor vehicles.

The applicant is requesting that Condition 21 be discharged based on the "*principles of the construction strategy*" and says a detailed CMP will only be submitted once the Principal Contractor has been appointed and "*therefore may be subject to change*".

It is unclear how this Condition can be discharged before the actual CMP is submitted and provides:

- *Details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works.*
- *works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders),*

As this will fall to the Principal Contractor appointed by BDW, until then it is not possible to justify the use of the High Street.

WSCC Highways says: "*The temporary use of High Street alongside the mitigation as set out within the CMP is consequently considered acceptable.*"

Where in the CMP does it provide evidence that the High Street is suitable or safe for use by construction traffic alongside non motorised users, until the upgrades to introduce a footpath along the High Street shown in Appendix A are completed?

If the upgrade is not completed in time, the CMP just assumes that it is possible to provide a temporary footpath long the south side of the High Street that will meet health and safety requirements. Will it run the whole length of the High Street? If so, from where to where? No road safety survey has been undertaken to confirm that this is feasible along the narrowest stretch where a tall flint wall borders the highway to the north. Or that it will provide a firm, level, well-drained pedestrian walkway that will allow residents and visitors safe access to their homes, the Spotted Cow PH or the Bridleway Bridge. All of which are on the opposite side of the highway.

Assumptions have also been made about the use of the High Street by vehicles, cyclists, residents and pedestrians (including families) and runners. There is no detail of the exit and entry routes into private driveways, public car parks, the Spotted Cow public house, the Bridleway Bridge's use by equestrians or access to the national park.

The Parish Council have also been contacted by the landlord of the Spotted Cow who is concerned that there has been no communication with residents, businesses or users affected by this proposal to understand the effect on the amenities of the

locality, or the existing loading and on-street parking arrangements, to identify and justify any highway restrictions that may need to be put in place.

The applicant in their email of 23 Nov 2020 says *“We are simply proposing to use the southern access whilst we construct the access at the north. The sooner the culvert is in place; the sooner we start accessing from Water Lane but it does nonetheless still take time to do those works.”*

But will the use of the High Street just be limited to building the Water Lane access?

The CMP suggests it will not, it says: *“At the same time as the northern access is being formed; Site Infrastructure, including primary drainage infrastructure and SUDS features, will be started in order to create an efficient build programme.”*

These works have nothing to do with Bridge construction and will significantly add to and predicted timescales and construction traffic using the High Street.

At this point in time it is not clear whether access from the High Street is acceptable or indeed possible without imposing restrictions on its use by residents and businesses. Therefore, either Arun must insist that a detailed CMP is submitted before this condition can be discharged, or other possible alternatives identified as a fall-back position.

When A/99/17/OUT was approved, the land north and south of Water Lane was under the control of the Applicant, Rydon Homes. WSCC Highways' response to the application suggested *“The land to the north which is also under the control of the applicant would provide an opportunity for a site compound to be located close by.”*

Has this option been explored? The Parish Council can see no reason why Rydon would refuse to come to an arrangement with BDW for temporary use of land until the bridge construction was completed.

Please see appendix 1 for a response to this plan from our Chair of Housing, Planning and Transport Committee – Cllr. John Oldfield - Construction Plan - A/157/20 Discharge of Condition 21 of A/99/17

Construction Plan - A/157/20 Discharge of Condition 21 of A/99/17

I am writing this not only as an Angmering Councillor but also as a retired Chartered Civil and Structural Engineer. I retired as Head of Engineering of a London Borough and prior to this I specialised in the design and construction of bridge and other highway structures such as culverts. I also had experience in the Royal Engineers of building bridges in “very mucky” conditions.

BDW are proposing the same Construction Plan for the construction of the embankment and culvert as that for the bridge. Although it is understood that there is no requirement to consult the APC over the discharge of conditions, the effect on the village of the currently proposed construction plan is so profound that we feel bound to comment.

As we have informed BDW ever since March 2020 when we first heard of their proposal, extensive use of the access from the High Street for construction traffic is totally unacceptable to the APC. They have chosen to totally ignore us and we now insist that entry from Water Lane should be investigated further.

The ground level in the vicinity to the proposed access point in Water Lane is reasonably close to that of the road. With a road closure over one or two weekends suitable material could be deposited on site to form a strong enough and clean area/platform to receive the further building materials needed for the culvert and embankment construction. It is noted that BDW had a vehicle on the ground working within this area, to the north of the Black Ditch, on 1st Dec (and presumably on other days) so it would be possible for suitable earth moving plant to assist in this and any preparatory work. Such plant has already been seen within the site area. After the deposit of the first few loads of material it should also be possible to get a compaction roller on to the site.

As noted on BDW's General Arrangement Plan it would be necessary to verify existing utilities within the Water Lane verge. Clearly any necessary work of lowering, strengthening or diverting would need to be carried out prior to commencement of the above. Obviously existing hedging etc would also need to be removed and replaced on completion of the works, but this initial loss of screening would be preferable to the prolonged use of the High Street entrance.

Any excavate material arising from the embankment and culvert construction, not required later, could be left on site until the road access is completed. As vehicles will be depositing on a clean area and then not loading with “muck away” limited wheel cleaning should be necessary.

Once the delivery area is established further deliveries could be managed with Stop/Go Boards in Water Lane. Method of delivery would be for vehicles to approach from the A280 and reverse into the delivery area and leave turning right towards the A280 again.

If required the delivery area/platform could be extended to the southern side of the Black Ditch using a temporary Armco culvert at the ditch itself (subject to EA and Others approval.)

I am sure the engineers responsible for the design and construction of this embankment could come up with other methods of building it with access from Water Lane. For example, depending on the proposed core of the structure, it may be possible to deposit the appropriate material directly onto the embankment site itself.