

From: Anita Gardner
Sent: 17 June 2019 12:15
To: 'John Henderson'
Subject: FW: Planning Application A/114/18/PL

Dear Mr Henderson,

I apologise for the delay in reply. I can advise that Mr Gee from County Highways forwarded me an e-mail to you dated 18-10-2019 which provided responses to the questions you raised and I attach it again for your information. I trust this answers your queries and will ensure this correspondence is scanned against the application on our website.

Regards

Anita Gardner

Anita Gardner | Principal Planner, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council | Location: First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37529 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737529 | E-mail: anita.gardner@arun.gov.uk

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk  Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Stephen Gee [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 May 2019 13:55
To: Anita Gardner
Subject: FW: Planning Application A/114/18/PL

Based on the spelling mistake in the original email you may not have received this.

Stephen

From: Stephen Gee
Sent: 30 May 2019 13:54
To: anita.gadner@arun.gov.uk
Cc: neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Planning Application A/114/18/PL

Anita,
Should you wish to reply to Mr Henderson, I have already addressed these questions in the attached email.

Stephen

From: John Henderson [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 May 2019 17:08
To: Planning; anita.gadner@arun.gov.uk; neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk
Cc: Parish Clerk (Angmering); Stephen Gee
Subject: Planning Application A/114/18/PL

For the attention of the Planning Case Officer.

Dear Sirs

I wish to forward my thanks for being sent the notification that the above application has been approved, subject to certain conditions, together with the full Officers Report and Decision Letter dated 28th May 2019. Having read through the report and even though it has been approved I have a couple of questions concerning the parking arrangements.

In the Consultation Report received from Stephen Gee of the West Sussex County Council Highways Department it states....

Layout - Vehicle tracking has been provided and is accepted. The site will provide 27 car parking spaces in line with standards and would be expected to generate a peak demand of 20 spaces. A total of 4 cycle parking spaces are to be provided in line with standards.

Question 1. Can you please provide details of how the "peak demand of 20 spaces" has been calculated and when it is expected to be?

Question 2. Can you please advise if the "27 car parking spaces in line with standards" is based solely on the needs of the residents and visitors to the 70 bed care home or is it calculated to be "in line with standards" based on the requirements of the residents, visitors and **"all the staff needed to run"** the 70 bed care home?

Thanking you in anticipation of your reply.

Kind Regards.

John Henderson

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.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 October 2018 19:43
To: Stephen Gee
Subject: Re: Planning Application A/114/18/PL

Dear Mr Gee

May I start by saying thank you for finding the time and taking the trouble to answer my questions.

To respond to your last comment first, yes I have written objecting to the planning application as have 70 other concerned people.

I do understand the importance and use of TRICS information to provide standard comparisons, but developers can use it to prove a negative and Planning Committees accept the developers assurance that the application meets the TRICS standard as proof, but hopefully you will also accept that reality and common sense has a part to play, in this case a single dwelling is being demolished, lived in by a single family of I believe 4 adults, it is being replaced by 29 two bedroom care apartments and a 70 bed care home yet the number of journeys will be reduced. Maybe there is time for you to revise your decisions?

- The baseline being compared with is that of the consented development of the site ref A/27/16/PL for 53 care apartments rather than the single dwelling currently on site. The previous planning permission has established that the highway impact of A/27/16/PL would not result in a severe impact on the highway network. This current application results in a reduction of 3 in AM peak and increase of 2 in PM peak trips when compared which cannot be considered severe.

Again the use of standardised formula to decide on the number of parking spaces required for a particular development is understandable, but when that formula is 18 years out of date, that car ownership has increased by 40%, then the calculation used is no longer appropriate and should not the application be looked at more realistically? To think that 9 parking spaces are enough for visitors to the 70 residents, especially at weekends, or that 14 is sufficient for 23 staff at shift change over 3 times a day is concerning to the neighbourhood. A suggestion from WSCC for ADC to look more closely would carry some weight.

The applicant has provided a car parking assessment utilising the TRICS data to establish if the level of parking is appropriate for the predicted vehicle trips the site would generate. This is available in Table 5.3 of the Transport Assessment, utilising a worst case scenario where vehicles enter at the beginning of the hour and exit at the end of an hour the maximum predicted occupation would be 23 spaces (85%).

Finally the description of the people requiring parking in the WSCC SPG is so vague it's a gift to developers, The application states 24 staff are required to run a 70 bed care home so the calculation comes up with 14 spaces, what is not clear is what jobs the 23 will be doing, if they are all required as medical staff 1 per 25 residents and carers 1 per 5

residents what about the kitchen, cleaners and laundry staff, rather conveniently not included, When will WSCC update the SPG for Councils to use, both the description of the users and the formula used?

The parking requirements for all staff would be included within the guidance provided. WSCC are currently producing updated car parking guidance, however as yet this has not been adopted so is not a material planning consideration.

Sorry to go on a bit but this application is not appropriate for the site and village location.

Regards

John Henderson

On 16 Oct 2018, at 08:50, Stephen Gee <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Mr Henderson,

Thank you for your email concerning planning application ref A/114/18/PL. It should be noted that the application seeks an amendment to part of the previously approved application ref A/27/16/PL.

The applicant has utilised TRICS to determine potential vehicular trip generation. TRICS is a large database of traffic surveys from other completed developments. The database can be refined so as to select those uses comparable (in terms of location, accessibility, and use class) to that proposed and as such its use is accepted by WSCC.

The use of parking standards contained within the WSCC SPG is also accepted to provide sufficient onsite parking for the development.

If you have not already make representations directly to Arun as the local planning authority I would recommend that you do so.

Regards

Stephen

From: John Henderson [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 October 2018 18:25
To: Stephen Gee
Subject: Planning Application A/114/18/PL

Dear Mr Gee

I write in response to your submission to Arun District Council in respect of Planning Application A/114/18/PL Broadlees, Dappers Lane, Angmering for a 70 Bed Care Home.

I wish to question your statement on Trip Generation, you state replacing 24 care apartments with a 70 bed care home will reduce the number of two way trips in the morning peak hour by 3 and increase by 2 the number of similar trips in the afternoon peak hour, this is based on figures provided by the applicant using the National Standard TRICS but it would appear to reject reality, please review the submitted data factually and consider revising your submission.

You state that the 27 parking spaces are in line with standards, the standards the applicant relies on and you mention relate to the WSCC SPG adopted in 2003 using calculations from 1999, now 18 years out of date, just because the numbers comply in reality they are totally out of date and inadequate, where are staff going to park at shift change over, where are the visitors going to park? again please review the submitted data with an open mind rather than saying it ticks the box and consider revising your submission.

The impact on the local infrastructure is going to be considerable and not in a good way.

I agree more should be made done cycling and walking to work, however car ownership has grown by over 40% in the past 10 years whilst purchase of cycles has not.

Regards

John Henderson

Resident of Dappers Lane, Objector to the Application

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.