[redacted]

From: Andrew Watson [redacted]
Sent: 06 March 2017 10:43
To: Claire Potts; Planning
Subject: RE: Planning application CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Sirs,

I note that my comments have yet to be uploaded to the Planning Register. Please could you advise that they have been received and are being considered.

Kind Regards,

From: Andrew Watson
Sent: 24 February 2017 10:04
To: 'Claire.Potts@arun.gov.uk' <Claire.Potts@arun.gov.uk>; 'planning@arun.gov.uk' <planning@arun.gov.uk>
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Planning application CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Claire,

Further to my email below, Systra has now carried out some further work to show an alternative Mulgrave access solution, which would not compromise my client's (the Baird Family) land. I have attached the drawings for your consideration. I have also provided some commentary below which has been informed by Systra.

The Series of drawings ST17117-01,02,03 demonstrate that the current Mulgrave access arrangement would prejudice potential future access to my client's land.

The Drawings ST17117-04 and 05 show an alternative design which provides access into both my client's land; and the Mulgrave site, in compliance with DMRB standards. In these drawings, the Mulgrave access is shown relocated 40m to the south, allowing a ghost island into my client's land to be accommodated, and ensuring visibility compliance.

In the design, Systra has accommodated two refuge islands for cyclists, one to the north of the Baird land for access and one in between the two accesses. Systra has deemed that the pedestrian crossing at the roundabout is sufficient to cater to movements from the south into the Mulgrave site.

As per my previous email, we have had amicable discussions with the applicant's agent (Parker Dann) and they seem amenable to considering an alternative access arrangement (subject to their client's confirmation).

I would also reiterate the purpose of making these representations, which is as follows:

1. There is a need to think long term and strategically to ensure that potential future housing sites are not stymied; and

2. The changes suggested as part of the Mulgrave application are small scale, could easily be accommodated and would not prejudice the Mulgrave site.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards,

From: Lizzie Withall
Sent: 20 February 2017 12:09
To: 'Claire.potts@arun.gov.uk' <Claire.potts@arun.gov.uk>
[redacted]
Subject: Planning application CM/1/17/OUT

Dear Claire,

I am writing to comment on the above planning application which has been submitted by Mulgrave Properties. I will refer to the site as the 'Mulgrave site.'

My client, the Baird Family, owns land to the east of the Mulgrave site. At some stage in the future, they may wish to pursue a development opportunity on their land. In light of this, they have concerns with the proposed access strategy for the Mulgrave site. This is because it precludes potential future access to their land. My client has instructed transport consultants (Systra) to review the proposed Mulgrave access solution. They have provided the following commentary:

Our design work relating to the Mulgrave site has determined that the access Baird land would have to be located near to the northern boundary in order to minimise any conflict with the Mulgrave site ghost island. The result of locating the access in this position means that the generally accepted standard visibility cannot be achieved (4.5 x 120m, see paras 7.3-7.9 of Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TD 42/95). The design of the access would also require widening of the highway into 3rd party land (the Mulgrave site) in order to allow for the re-location of the proposed pedestrian refuge island.

An alternative would be for the Mulgrave site to move its access 25m to the south, so that the access into Baird land could be relocated to improve the visibility. This looks like it is achievable as the Mulgrave site access is off of the revised alignment to Church Lane, which the applicant could tailor to fit their visibility needs.

Systra has prepared technical drawings that demonstrate the point above, which we can make available upon request.

I would also point out that my client has received planning consent for access changes on some of their land (ref: CM/24/09). This consent has been implemented. However, no account appears to have been taken of this on the planning application drawings for the Mulgrave site.

In light of the above, we would like the applicant to reconsider their access strategy. We have approached them direct about this and they seem amenable to it, but no formal response has yet been received. As such, we felt it prudent to submit a representation on the application.

In summary, my client's position is that a small amendment to the current application would help to prevent future developable land from being prejudiced, which is important in the context of the District's housing need. I would be grateful if you could acknowledge this email and provide a response in due course.

I am on leave for a few days, starting this evening and returning Tuesday 21st February. I have therefore copied-in my client and Systra in case you have any immediate queries.

Kind Regards,

Andrew Watson MRTPI
Associate Planner
Rural

Exchange House, Petworth, GU28 0BF
[redacted]
savills Website :www.savills.co.uk

Before printing, think about the environment