

From: ALBERT MARINER [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 April 2018 21:01
To: Planning
Subject: Planning app A/36/18 - Land at Arundel Road, Angmering

Dear Planners,

I have been trying for the past 2 days to register an objection to the above application, via the Arun Planning Portal. Unfortunately, despite numerous edits, resulting in my comments now being in the order of 3422 characters, the system continues to reject it as being in excess of 3800 characters - I don't know what I'm doing wrong!

Could I please therefore, submit my original observations, (unedited) as part of this email?

Best regards,

Albert MARINER

With reference to this application, I have to object on the grounds of road safety. There are a number of issues which are inadequately addressed within the supporting Transport Assessment. Aside from the unfortunate transposition which has resulted in the majority of that document (and most of its supporting data interpretation) referring to the A259 as the A529; the trip generation model chosen to assess the traffic generated by this development, is we are told (TA 6.7.1), based upon that used in local planning application A/22/12. Given that application A/22/12 relates to a single dwelling accessed by a private drive on a private estate and has no such Transport Assessment associated with it, we are unable to determine the suitability or otherwise of the model cited. Additionally, this does not give confidence in the level of peer review of the submitted report, which is heavily dependant upon the interpretation of large amounts of data and one must wonder what other numerical inconsistencies may be present and their effect on the whole.

The proposed development is to be accessed via 2 separate junctions within Arundel Road, the primary point being the northernmost. This is within a national speed limit section (60 mph). The supplied traffic data suggests an 85th percentile average speed for the whole surveyed period of 37.6 mph, with an associated safe stopping distance (SSD) of 59.61 metres. The report correctly states this visibility is afforded by their design (or within 0.6 metre to be accurate). However, this visibility is only adequate for vehicles travelling at or below 37.6 mph. The supplied data clearly records an average 27% of remaining northbound traffic (between 8 am & 9 am) to be travelling in excess of this speed - on average 46 mph and in some cases up to 55 mph. As the Safety Auditors acknowledge, this is a 60 mph limit and vehicles can lawfully travel up to that speed (thankfully, very few do and this is also reflected in the supplied data. That said, numerous vehicles are recorded as having passed at up to 55 mph during the peak AM periods throughout the school week). The proposed main junction can barely meet the minimum visibility for traffic on Arundel Road and cannot provide the 79 metres visibility necessary to see the average 46 mph of the remaining 27% (1 in 4 vehicles in real terms) of traffic approaching from the south. It is sobering to consider that the SSD for 60 mph is a totally unattainable (for this location) 121.7 metres.

A further complication is that currently, at school times, vehicles park along the western road edge within Arundel Road up to (and on several recent occasions) beyond the hill crest. This is well within the visibility splay of the proposed site access and would severely compromise the already minimal 59 metres available. The height of this parking occurs when pupils are being delivered to school in the morning, precisely at the peak period for traffic exiting the development and others using Arundel Road.

Another concern has been raised by the Safety Audit team - that of the access to the site afforded to refuse vehicles. The TA report's authors appear to have misinterpreted the auditors' concern in this respect, as they only refer to the goods vehicle's intrusion into the (southbound) right turn lane from Arundel Road into the development. The Auditors' concern includes the need for the left turning goods vehicle to fully occupy the (eastbound) exit lane from the development onto Arundel Road. If the vehicle is prevented (by leaving traffic) to use this lane, it cannot enter the development until that traffic has cleared and would therefore have to remain within Arundel Road until such an opportunity arose. This would quickly lead to a build up of traffic behind it and (with the presence of parked vehicles from the school) a complete obstruction of the southbound lane, with nowhere for the majority of the site's exiting traffic to go. The design engineers appear to ignore the fact that refuse vehicles will not be the only large goods vehicles which will have to access the development throughout a normal day. Numerous deliveries by larger vehicles are commonplace nowadays with the increase of online shopping. It would seem logical to re-engineer the proposed junction's bell mouth to better facilitate such manoeuvres.

No consideration whatsoever appears to have been given in safety terms, to the proposed use of the second (southernmost) site access point and its existence appears solely considered in plan terms alone. It would seem premature to approve this application when half of its access points have yet to be assessed in terms of safety, particularly when the as yet unconsidered access, is within metres of the primary school.

No consideration appears to have given to the fact that the A259 Littlehampton Road is about to be upgraded to dual-carriageway and what effect this will have on the ability (or more likely otherwise) of vehicles attempting to join it from Station Road and Roundstone Lane. Currently, vehicles circulating both roundabouts at peak times, do so slowly and this permits vehicle on the minor roads to join alternately with those already on the major road. If they are prevented from so doing, because of the higher flow rate on the roundabout, then the existing queue lengths will extend, without the addition of extra vehicles from this development.

The A27 is also scheduled to have extensive work carried out in the coming years (Arundel by-pass); what effect this will have on the ability of traffic from this development to be accommodated within the junction to perform a "U-turn" at Poling can only be guessed at.

Whilst the proposal is for the development to include an additional football pitch within its area, no indication is given as to any additional parking provision for those attending the pitch - presumably it will not be solely used by the estate's residents? If no additional parking capacity is to be provided, this will place an additional burden upon Arundel Road and considerably further reduce the visibility afforded drivers attempting to exit the development. Little if any thought appears to have been given to the siting of the football pitch, which appears haphazardly inserted onto the plans and at the cost of more general play areas within the development as a whole.