

David Easton
Arun District Council
First Floor
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Date: 12 June 2018
Our ref: 14714/03/SSL/16039700v1
Your ref: BE/40/18/PL

Dear Mr Easton

New Barn Lane: Application for new access from New Barn Lane to Land West of New Barn Lane & relocation of 5 no. existing parking spaces

We write on behalf of our client, The Church Commissioners for England. We have considered the objection made by Bersted Parish Council on the above application.

Our responses to each of the reasons identified for the objection are detailed below.

Objection reason 1 states:

"The proposed new entrance is unneighbourly to the bungalows (11, 21 New Barn lane) directly in front of the access"

Response:

The Transport Assessment produced by Pell Frischmann shows that there is expected to be a light level of traffic using this access road. The trip generation from the consented 50-unit development that the proposed access will serve, is expected to be less than one vehicle movement per every two minutes in the weekday AM and PM peak hours. Outside of the peak hours, the traffic generation from the consented development is estimated to be one vehicle movement every 3.3 minutes (9-5pm). The layout and location of the road is appropriate for its context and has been agreed with WSCC Highways following a pre-application submission.

Objection reason 2 states:

"Loss of parking for those bungalows 19 21 New Barn lane, removal of the 5 spaces to a new location inside the development does not guarantee that they will get use of them and is contrary to Bersted Neighbourhood Development plan policy HDQ8 for accessible car parking."

Response:

In the Highways Authority comment on the application, the re-provision of the parking spaces was considered, and wasn't deemed to cause reason to refuse the application:

“The provision of the 5 car parking spaces along the site access does not guarantee the use of these spaces to existing residents, however given the level of on-street car parking availability in this area this is not considered to warrant a reason to refuse the application”.

Objection reason 3:

“Highway safety and traffic, as bungalows 11 to 17 have driveways that are in direct line with the proposed access which may cause safety issues.”

Response:

The Transport Statement that was provided in support of the planning application demonstrated that highway safety would not be an issue with this proposed development. The proposed site access arrangements were tested in terms of swept path analysis. It was demonstrated that the proposed junction will provide adequate visibility splays in accordance with the appropriate DfT/DCLG Manual for Streets standards. In addition to this, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out. The Stage 1 RSA concluded that there were no issues with the proposed design, although it did note that the revised location of a telegraph pole should be provided at the detailed design stage. This comment was accepted.

WSCC as Highways Authority were consulted on this application. They have considered the proposals and the associated Transport Statement, and have no objections to the proposed access arrangements.

Should you have any queries on the above, please do not hesitate to contact me or my colleague Pauline Roberts.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of Joe Larner.

Joe Larner
Senior Planner