

Neil White
3 Old Moat Close
Shripney
Bognor Regis
West Sussex
PO22 9UP

Your Ref: OWPC2984
Our Ref: BE/63/14/PL 21-05-2014
Please ask for:
Mr C Cronin

24th June 2014

Dear Sir/Madam

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (as amended)

Installation of Solar Farm comprising erection of solar arrays, inverters, transformers, equipment housing, security fencing, internal tracks & ancillary equipment. Departure from the Development Plan.

Manor Farm Shripney Lane Shripney

Thank you for your internet representation made on 24th June 2014 which has been recorded as '**an objection**' with the comments as follows:

A summary of my main concerns is as follows:

- the proposal makes provision for conflict with opposing HGV vehicles on Shripney Lane (recognising this would be impossible to resolve without complex manoeuvring) but makes no such provision for conflicts with residential or farm traffic.

- while 5.2.6 of the transport management plan asserts the lane is 'wide enough' for residential traffic and HGV's to pass (thus trivialising the challenge), this is a purely 'theoretical' statement. Passing tractors (which are typically less wide than HGV) is, from experience, only practical by either vehicle pulling onto verges, banks or adjacent driveways to allow for safe passage of vehicles. For those unaware of the hidden / obstructed drainage ditches that run the length of the lane this (already) presents a risk. At a stated lane width of 4.6-4.8m, and given the maximum width of a HGV (2.55m) and a typical road car (1.9-2m), no one will pass HGV vehicles on the section of road between the A29 and Manor Farm. Drivers will have to reverse to areas with greater width to allow safe passage, which will either be the entrance to Shripney Lane at the junction of the A29, or on the corner near Manor Farm. Neither are safe given they involve reversing into blind cornering traffic (a risk which will be compounded by the increase in traffic volume the development would bring).

- the proposal states average deliveries per day rather than peak volumes. Inevitably construction deliveries will peak over a shorter window than the end to end construction period, and could easily be 2-3x the average currently stated.

- while the proposal states no 'amendments' to verges / banks will be required (5.2.10 CMTP), passing will inevitably result in damage to roadside banks and verges. It already occurs today passing tractors, with some residents placing obstructions on their verges to try and prevent damage taking place by restricting use of verges as passing areas.

- given the proposed daily to/from commute of 30-40 additional construction workers and an average of 12 HGV transits per day it is difficult to see how one could conclude (section 5.4.1 CTMP) that this represents a 'minor increase' with 'no noticeable or material traffic impact' given current volumes and categories of traffic along Shripney Lane. The average HGV traffic alone represent an order of magnitude increase in wide berth / heavy vehicular access. I have no doubt residents will both 'notice it' and consider it 'material'. Prior to relief

road construction residents could have had an alternative access route to mitigate impact but this is no longer an option.

- no reference is made to potential overlaps in peak farming periods where an increase in farm vehicle access to Manor Farm could run in parallel to construction periods

Your views will be considered before the application is determined and I shall write to inform you of any decision made.

Please be aware that if the application is to be determined by the Council's Development Control committee and your letter has been received at a late stage after the Agenda has been published you will not receive a separate letter notifying you of the date of the meeting and procedures for public speaking. In such circumstances it is recommended that you track the progress of the application on the Council's website or telephone the Council for further information. Please be advised that any comments you make that are not included within the Committee Agenda will be reported to the Members of the Development Control committee. Please also be aware that only a small number of all planning applications received go to the Development Control Committee. Most are determined under delegated powers by Officers in which case your comments will again be considered before the application is determined.

Please be aware that Planning Services operate an 'open file' policy and will publish details of your comments on the internet on the Arun District Council Planning section. Please ensure that you only provide information that you are happy will be made available in this way. If you supply information belonging to a third party, please ensure you have their permission to do so. If you do not wish your comments to appear on the 'open file' please confirm this in writing and I will arrange for it to be destroyed although this means that its contents will then be disregarded.

In the event of a subsequent written representations appeal, against a refusal of planning permission on a householder application, any representations made on the application will be automatically forwarded to the Secretary of State. Unlike all other types of appeal, there will be no further opportunity to comment at the appeal stage.

Yours faithfully

Karl Roberts
Assistant Director Planning & Economic Regeneration