

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 27 July 2020 08:21
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Planning Application A/76/20/PL

Amanda Scholes | Receptionist, Department, [Arun District Council](#) | Location: Ground Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37736 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737500 ext 37736 | E-mail: amanda.scholes@arun.gov.uk



Visit Arun's web site at [Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.](#)



Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 July 2020 09:33
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Katie Herr [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Application A/76/20/PL

Please upload the email trail below onto Ocella for planning application A/76/20/PL.

This is an objection from a local resident on highway safety grounds.

Thanks,

Michael

Michael Eastham
Principal Planning Officer,
Planning Department

T: 01903 737772

E: michael.eastham@arun.gov.uk



Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: John Adams [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 July 2020 11:54
To: Angmering Parish Council <[REDACTED]>
Subject: FW: Planning Application A/76/20/PL

I am aware that the Parish Council have lodged an objection to the Planning Application to build 84 new dwellings on land west of Dappers Lane in which you make reference to highway safety. You will know that there have also been a great many objections from local residents. A high proportion of these express concerns about this and other approved (but not yet built) developments resulting in a large increase in the volume of traffic in Dappers Lane exposing all the walkers, cyclists and horse riders to a significant and foreseeable risk.

A number of residents' objections pointed out that WSCC's published opinions and conclusions on this application regarding highway safety in Dappers Lane are a direct contradiction to their published views and conclusions in an earlier application (A/55/16/PL) and Arun DC's website last week posted correspondence showing that this had now been pointed out to WSCC, who had provided their response. This response did not cover the major contradiction relating to highway safety in the northern section of the lane, and consequently I emailed the Case Officer Michael Eastham on 16th July (see below).

I realise that this email was after the closing date for lodging objections, which may be why it has not appeared on Arun DC's website. However, I do feel it appropriate to send you a copy as I would hope that the Parish Council would also raise this very clear and obvious contradiction with Arun DC Planning.

Regards

John Adams
Woodlands, Dappers Lane, Angmering, BN16 4EN

From: John Adams [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 July 2020 14:50
To: 'Michael Eastham' <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application A/76/20/PL

Dear Michael

You have recently posted on your website correspondence asking you to ensure that the concerns about highway safety expressed in many objection letters are brought to the attention of WSCC, and the correspondent specifically pointed out that the views and conclusions of WSCC, acting as Highway Authority and expressed by Stephen Gee, are significantly contrary to those published in the objection raised by Dominic Smith of WSCC Strategic Planning (in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority) in 2016 in relation to application A/55/16/PL.

You also published Stephen Gee's response to this having been pointed out to him, which states that:-

"the reason for refusal (of A/55/16/PL) is based on the lack of information (no speed survey) provided to establish if a safe access could be provided",

adding that A/76/20/PL has provided speed surveys and does provides suitable access. He also says that each application is assessed on its own merits.

With regard to A/55/16/PL, Dominic Smith's objection was indeed partly based on his view that the proposed site access would adversely affect the safety of highway users, but he also gave a further very strong and clear reason, that:-

"Dappers Lane, from the change in speed limit to the south of the site and continuing north, is unsatisfactory to serve the proposed development by reason of its inadequate width and forward visibility, and the proposal would be likely to generate additional traffic that would lead to conditions detrimental to highway safety".

This second reason was clearly and specifically pointed out by your original correspondent and is also clearly shown in the Case Officer's report as one of the reasons for refusing that application.

Dominic Smith also made the following statements regarding the nature of both the southern and northern sections of Dappers Lane:-

“The southern end of Dappers Lane is subject to a 30mph speed limit and carriageway widths are sufficient to enable two cars to pass one another; the alignment in this section of Dappers Lane is relatively straight and affords good forward visibility. To the North, Dappers Lane moves into a derestricted section where the road narrows to a single track road; it is not of a sufficient width to enable two vehicles to pass one another.”

Referring to the anticipated increase in traffic, he states:-

“This will increase the likelihood of vehicles passing one another and, coupled with the lack of passing places or refuge, could result in sudden stopping and reversing manoeuvres, to the detriment of the safety of both other motorists and non-vehicular users of the road or erosion of the verge through overrunning”.

Referring to the northern section of Dappers Lane, he states:-

“the speed limit becomes derestricted and the road narrows” and “There is dense vegetation on both sides of the carriageway and the limited verge adjacent to the highway is steep, providing no refuge for vulnerable carriageway users. This area is also unlit”.

By referring only to the matter of a suitable site access and totally ignoring the very serious concerns regarding highway safety in the northern section of Dappers Lane, Stephen Gee has failed to provide any sort of adequate, let alone comprehensive, response to the questions which have been raised regarding how his opinions and conclusions in respect of this application can possibly be explained, let alone reconciled, with the published opinions and conclusions of Dominic Smith in respect of the earlier application A/55/16/PL. It also appears that by assessing each application individually, no account is taken of the cumulative impact of other approved applications in assessing the impact on increasing traffic volume.

I believe it to be essential that these contradictions now be considered in greater detail.

Best regards

John Adams