

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
<https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>

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

Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



[REDACTED]

From: steve grimwood [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 August 2021 10:15
To: Steven Shaw [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Planning application CM/34/21/PL carwash A259 Clymping

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Mr Shaw

Thank you once again for your prompt reply, However, your response seems to prompt more questions rather than answers!

The comment 'In the last 5 year period there have not been any accidents at the access to the Maidenhead Aquatics site' demonstrates the lack of local knowledge and understanding the Highways department has regarding this site when decisions are made from desks. It was sold three years ago to Maidenhead Aquatics as the farm shop was failing i.e. not getting many customers (as detailed in their application CM/27/18/PL to sell to Maidenhead Aquatics), therefore fewer vehicles using the junction. That is why there may not have been any accidents. Since

that time the following businesses (with different opening times and different clientele which has to mean increased movement) have all applied to use this point of access.

1. Campsite with caravans – more vehicles in and out
2. Drive thru café – with the applicants describing the A259 as 'rammo' and HGV drivers inquiring on their facebook page as to whether they'll be able to access the new café. New customers plus increased deliveries equals more traffic in and out
3. A garden centre – new clients plus deliveries equals more vehicles in and out
4. A dementia care home – visitors, staff, deliveries, emergency access for ambulances – more traffic in and out.
5. Building site for the dementia care home – lorries for deliveries, builders, inspectors etc for 18 – 24 months – more traffic, much of it heavy vehicles in and out.

The highways department may successfully argue that individually each one of these businesses would not 'further contribute or have negative implications to highway safety that justify a refusal of planning permission.' but it should be looking at the cumulative effect of 5 more businesses on a site that used to house just one, and conclude logically that safety would become an issue. Never has the phrase 'a car crash waiting to happen' been more apt.

The very statement 'The closure of Crookthorn Lane is considered as a potential option to reduce some of the different movements onto the A259' shows that movement onto the A259 on this stretch is considered to be enough of a concern to propose the closure of an actual road to motorised traffic. This directly contradicts the department's approval of what is basically becoming a new retail park which will vastly increase movements just a few yards away.

Our question regarding the fact that no objection is being made to the car wash simply because the Highways department thinks all its clientele will be on the A259 already and extra movement on and off the road at this point is not an issue has still not been answered. If that is the highways department's justification for not opposing this application, we will state again: if increased movements on /off the A259 are not a safety issue along this stretch then there can be no need to spend millions of pounds realigning junctions and introducing a roundabout just yards from this site 'to address road safety concerns, reduce delays from side roads'. It defies logic that one part of the highways department is attempting to reduce / improve manouvres from side roads at some points but permitting increased movement at another only a few yards away.

In, what we hope will be our final piece of correspondence(!) we would like a definitive yes / no answer from the Highways department on the following two points

1. Are movements on / off the A259 along the stretch from the church lane roundabout to the Oystercatcher pub a safety concern that needs addressing?
2. Could the increased traffic in and out of the Maidenhead Aquatics access point from all the businesses described in our first paragraph potentially have safety implications for this stretch of the A259?

The Highways department needs to actually visit the site, to assess visibility, rather than just relying on a map and the cumulative effect of each of these businesses needs to be considered before the department simply rubber stamps another development at this site. The decision of 'no objection' to the carwash is based on current traffic flow in and out of this access point, not what it will be like when all of these businesses are up and running. What may seem like a trivial matter to the Highways department, has considerable impact on the residents of Clymping, and increases the difficulty in preserving the 'Clymping Gap' for future generations.

Yours sincerely
Rachel and Stephen Grimwood

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: Steven Shaw
Sent: 16 August 2021 16:07
To: steve.grimwood

Subject: RE: Planning application CM/34/21/PL carwash A259 Clymping

Dear Mrs Grimwood,

Thank you for your email.

In terms of highway safety my previous email was simply making reference to the proposals as part of CM/34/21/PL and other recent planning applications on this site. These proposals are not considered to exacerbate any highway safety issues or due to deficiencies in the design pose any new safety concerns. Whilst the accident data shows that there are accidents along the A259 there is not sufficient evidence through the design or the forecast impact of these proposals that they would further contribute or have negative implications to highway safety that justify a refusal of planning permission.

In terms of the closure of Crookthorn Lane our understanding was that in your original correspondence you were making reference to WSCC comments on another planning application rather than the A259 consultation. The closure of Crookthorn Lane was one of several proposals that were put forward for consideration as part of a key stakeholder engagement for the A259 Littlehampton to Bognor Regis feasibility corridor study in Summer of 2020. As part of this study and given its early feasibility stage a number of alternative arrangements were considered. As a result of the key stakeholder engagement and subsequent conversations with local interest groups, the arrangement proposing closure of Crookthorn Lane is under review.

The closure of Crookthorn Lane was considered as a potential option to reduce some of the different movements onto the A259. It was not introduced because the turning into Crookthorn Lane is deemed to be inherently unsafe and therefore it is not correct to infer that the movement into the Maidenhead Aquatics site is unsafe as it is closer to the Oystercatcher Junction. In the last 5 year period there have not been any accidents at the access to the Maidenhead Aquatics site.

In terms of the comments about the need for a revision to the Maidenhead Aquatics access this is as a result of any revised arrangement at the Oystercatcher junction and the need to change this access to appropriately accommodate a revised junction arrangement such as a roundabout at the Oystercatcher.

I note the other parties you have copied into this correspondence so they are aware of it and I have also forwarded a copy of our correspondence to the Arun District Council planning case officer so they are aware of the issues you have raised.

Regards

Steven Shaw BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT
County Highways (Development Management) Team Manager
County Highways Team, Planning Services
West Sussex County Council

Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk

From: steve.grimwood
Sent: 10 August 2021 16:57
To: Steven Shaw

[REDACTED]
Subject: Planning application CM/34/21/PL carwash A259 Clymping

Dear Mr Shaw

Thank you for your prompt reply.

Please could I have it confirmed: your department is stating that along this stretch of the A259 it is not manoeuvres on and off the main road that affect highway safety, simply the amount of vehicles already on the A259? If that is the case, why is the Highways department is proposing a multi-million pound project to re-align or introduce roundabouts a matter of metres from the Maidenhead Aquatic access point? Roundabouts will only affect the flow of traffic entering and leaving the A259 not the amount of traffic already on the road. So, according to your department's criteria for road safety there can be no justification for them unless, perhaps vehicles turning on and off the A259 here does affect road safety? It should be noted that the fatalities along this stretch of road have, in the main been, at junctions, when vehicles have been entering the A259, not caused by volume or the speed of traffic already on the road.

Secondly, I am totally bemused by your comment 'we are unaware of the specific comments relating to prevention of vehicles turning into Crookthorn Lane.' Your department issued proposals for public consultation one of which was 'Closure of Crookthorn Lane and convert into a shared use footpath/cycle path'. If it is deemed that turning south off the A259 is dangerous, how can a few metres up the road, 6 businesses, all with differing opening times, and clientele, plus a construction worksite also using the access point not deemed to affect highway safety? The Highway department also states in its 'improvement' proposals that 'the access arrangement for Maidenhead Aquatics may be subject to revision. ' If it is not considered a problem now, why may it be an issue when all the other 'improvements' have been carried out?

The Highways Authority proposal also states that 'improvements' need to be carried out 'To address road safety concerns, reduce delays from side roads' but if I understand your email correctly amount of traffic turning on and off the A259 is not a safety issue, only the total volume of traffic on the A259. If this is not the case and delays accessing the A259 are a safety concern, then the Maidenhead Aquatics access point being used by 6 different businesses and a construction work site, could, I'm sure your department would have to agree, cause considerable delays in accessing the A259, with the probability of increased frustration and therefore risk taking to join the flow of traffic?

I am copying our correspondence to various interested parties such as Cllr Jacky Pendleton, Cllr Amanda Worne, MP Nick Gibb, Parish Councillor Colin Humphris, ADC Director of Place Karl Roberts and planning officer Neil Crowther. It is important for those making planning decisions to understand that the 'advice' given by the Highway Authority for this planning application directly contradicts other proposals being made by the same department and is based solely on desk / map working, when the real life situation needs to be analysed at, for example 8.00 on a weekday morning in term time.

I look forward to you clarifying the points that I am unsure of and answering the 5 questions I have asked.

Yours sincerely
Rachel Grimwood

Steven Shaw [REDACTED]
Tue 8/10/2021 1:56 PM

Dear Mrs Grimwood,

Thank you for your recent enquiry to West Sussex County Council (WSSC) in relation to planning application CM/34/21/PL. My name is Steven Shaw and I manage the County Highways team at WSSC who assess the transport implications of new development; I have therefore been asked to look into your enquiry.

One of the key considerations when assessing a planning application is the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented on highway grounds if it would result in an unacceptable highway safety impact, or if the cumulative impact on the road network would be severe. This is the context for what we have to assess planning applications against.

When assessing a planning application, we assess the specific impact that development shall have and the potential increase in trips the proposals shall generate. Whilst the proposals at this site could result in an increase in trips on the A259, not all the trips associated with these proposals are newly generated trips. For example, given the nature of the proposals, some of the trips associated with the proposed uses may be "pass-by" trips that are already travelling on the network but simply stop to visit the site on a trip elsewhere. Taking this into consideration, the proposals are not anticipated to result in a significant material intensification of movements on the local highway network that would be deemed to have a severe impact or unacceptable highway safety impact; as per the NPPF.

Regarding the use of the existing access on the A259, we have assessed the suitability of the existing access in accordance with the stopping sight distances (SSD) requirements outlined in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), namely the CD-109 Highway Link Design. CD-109 provides technical requirements for all aspects of highway link design, including vehicular visibility splays and stopping sight distances. For roads subject to a 40-mph speed restriction, this sets out a requirement of visibility splays of 2.4m x 120m in both directions at the point of access onto the maintained highway. An inspection of local mapping shows that visibility splays in excess of this minimum requirement are achievable at the existing point of access onto the A259. The proposed access is therefore considered to be a safe arrangement for the likely level of traffic.

In reference to your comments regarding previous WSSC comments at the site, we are unaware of the specific comments relating to prevention of vehicles turning into Crookthorn Lane. However, considering the above, it is not possible to provide suitable justification or evidence that the proposals would have a severe transport impact on the local highway network or an unacceptable highway safety concern.

Planning application CM/34/21/PL shall ultimately be determined by Arun District Council rather than WSSC. Therefore if you haven't already I would recommend that you also put in writing any comments you have on the planning application to Arun District Council in their role as Local Planning Authority.

Regards

Steven Shaw BA (Hons) MSc MCIHT
County Highways (Development Management) Team Manager
County Highways Team, Planning Services



Sent from Mail for Windows

LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.