



From: Hebe Smith <Hebe.Smith@arun.gov.uk> **On Behalf Of** Planning

Sent: 05 September 2022 12:14

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: FP/274/21/OUT - Bognor Regis Golf Club Proposals - Comments relating to the CHA's Response

Hebe Smith (she/her)

Planning Degree Apprentice, Planning

T: 01903 737626

E: hebe.smith@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF

www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to [Planning application finder \(arun.gov.uk\)](http://arun.gov.uk)



From: Geoffrey Winch [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 September 2022 15:18
To: Tim Townsend [REDACTED]
Cc: Steven Shaw [REDACTED] Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk> [REDACTED]
Simon Wild [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FP/274/21/OUT - Bognor Regis Golf Club Proposals - Comments relating to the CHA's Response

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 Tim

Thank you for replying to my email, and I do appreciate your reasons for declining to respond to the two scenarios I outlined, especially with regard to time restraints. I will, however, aim to make time of my own during the next week or so to set out my own former professional views on how any planning application should be assessed in terms of minimising the effects with respect to safety on the publicly maintainable highway resulting from the traffic generated, and the generated traffic's impact on the operational efficiency of the local highway network.

As a former colleague of yours I did not wish to proceed with this without first giving you the opportunity of outlining your own approach and I am satisfied that I have now afforded you such an opportunity. I will, of course, copy you in when I submit my further comments to Arun DC. You may thereafter, especially if you consider my methodology to be inappropriate, wish to make your own further representations to the Planners.

I send you my best wishes,

Kind regards,

Geoff

On Fri, Sep 2, 2022 at 9:50 AM Tim Townsend [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Geoff,

Thank you for your further email on this subject dated 26th August and found below.

As you will appreciate, officers can only consider what is presented before them in the as-submitted planning application and not hypothetical scenarios. Time and resource also play a part in this. For those reasons, I am not going to respond to the two scenarios you present below.

I regret that this is not the reply you were hoping for.

I note that you intend to reply further to my previous email of 25th August (also found below) and as such, I look forward to receiving that in due course.

Kind regards,

Tim

Tim Townsend, MCIT

Principal Transport Planner, County Highways Team – Highways, Transport and Planning
West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RQ



Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk

From: Geoffrey Winch [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 August 2022 14:47
To: Tim Townsend [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: FP/274/21/OUT - Bognor Regis Golf Club Proposals - Comments relating to the CHA's Response

****EXTERNAL****

Dear Tim

Thanks for responding to my email. After I have had time to read and consider your comments in detail I will make a further response to you, and will of course copy-in the Case Officer at Arun DC since you seem to be agreeable to my doing so. I consider this essential to ensure that there is transparency which is always in the wider public interest.

Before formulating my own comments, however, I need to fully understand your approach when applying strategic highway considerations to this particular application, or for that matter, any other application which might be made in similar circumstances. With this in mind I would be most obliged if you would consider the two following scenarios – the first unfortunately has to be hypothetical but is, nevertheless, relevant, whilst the second could be a distinct possibility, so again entirely relevant.

Having considered the two scenarios I would be further obliged if you would then briefly outline how you would respond in each of the circumstances, and if an Objection or a recommendation of Refusal, what your reasons would be.

A) If the site was included for residential development in the current Local Plan, and an application was made for the development using Downview Road as the sole means of access for vehicular traffic despite the fact that access could be achieved from the Lec Airfield Link Road. How would you respond bearing in mind that, 1) as the development would be in accordance with the Local Plan, and 2) as the Link Road already is in accordance – then the developers, if necessary, could request Arun DC to secure all the land needed to deliver the Link Road by initiating CPO procedures if private treaty negotiations failed.

B) If the applicants should now withdraw their application and resubmit it in due course when the Salt Box enterprise site is completed or nearly completed, and at which point the Lec Airfield site will become the primary site for accommodating new enterprise businesses. This would mean that

the Link Road either will have been or probably be in the process of being delivered and would be, in part, passing through the Golf Course site itself. If the resubmitted application still proposed Downview Road as the sole means of access for vehicular traffic, would you object or recommend a refusal on highway grounds knowing that access could readily be achieved via the Link Road?

If, having considered these scenarios, and you chose not to Object or recommend a Refusal and, therefore, as a consequence you were content or would seem to be content to allow the development using Downview Road as the sole means of access for vehicular traffic – what particular policy (or policies) or guidance would you use in order to justify that decision?

May I ask you please, Tim, to respond at an early date in order that I can ensure my further response will be comprehensive in nature.

I send you my regards,

Geoff

On Thu, Aug 25, 2022 at 10:48 AM Tim Townsend [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Geoff,

Thank you for your email of 2nd August found below and the associated attachments setting out your concerns about the residential development on the Bognor Regis Golf Club site.

In your representations you raise a number of points. However, reading through both attachments, your key concerns seem to focus on the following areas:

- 1.Suitability of access to/from the development using Downview Road (including emergency access), instead of the A259;
- 2.Suitability of Downview Road during the construction phase and concern about the road becoming damaged as a result of HGV traffic;
- 3.Suitability of the Downview traffic signals to accommodate the traffic generated by the development and some types of construction vehicles during the construction phase;
- 4.Suitability of the Road Safety Audit undertaken for the site access works at the northern end of Downview Road/Golf Links Lane;

5. Access by sustainable modes; and,
6. Consideration of proposals on land referred to in the current Arun Local Plan as 'Enterprise' (including LEC airfield) for commercial development including a link road.

My responses are as follows:

1. Suitability of access to/from the development using Downview Road (including emergency access) instead of the A259.

The site was not included as part of the former Site 6 and as such has come forward independently of any allocated sites. As you know, Site 6 was taken through the Local Plan process which included the long-term commitment to provide a re-aligned A259 which has now been achieved. This site has not been considered through any Local Plan and as such, the Highway Authority has had to consider it on its own merits, including access to Downview Road.

In my discussions with the applicant's transport consultants, it was made clear by them that their client does not have control over the land between their site and the new A259, hence their application seeking access using Downview Road. There are, however, several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) running through the site connecting both north and south of the site (and to the A259) and these will be improved to provide foot and cycle access – some of which being delivered 'physically' by the applicants and the rest by WSCC using contributions secured from the development via S106 Agreement. This will assist with sustainable access in and out of the development and to the surrounding area and other transport links, goods, services, shopping and schools etc.

With regard to Downview Road and the access design, in addition to the original Road Safety Audit, a further Addendum Note was provided by the applicants given that changes to the originally submitted layout arose out of discussions with the Highway Authority. In the main, WSCC sought to achieve improved foot and cycle access at the point the new road interfaces with the existing roads. The access width has also been adjusted slightly (widened) to provide for vehicles passing one-another on the bend as it enters the site and all matters raised in the Safety Audit have, in the opinion of the Highway Authority, been adequately addressed.

Turning to your point about emergency access, there is no requirement for such a site to have a second or emergency access. Historically, DB32 did recommend one be provided where development exceeded a certain threshold but since that document was superseded, guidance in the form of Manual for Streets does not make it a specific requirement and all sites are considered on a case-by-case basis. As you know, the developer has offered one and I acknowledge (as have you) that it is close to the formal vehicular access point to the site. However, even in the unlikely event Downview Road or the development access became blocked, there is still a network of roads that vehicles (emergency or otherwise) could still use to reach the site in the event of an emergency.

2. Suitability of Downview Road during the construction phase and concern about the road becoming damaged as a result of HGV traffic.

A site such as this would require a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted and agreed with the Highway Authority prior to works commencing. This would be put in place to safeguard local highways

infrastructure, other highway users, residents, businesses etc. If any deficiencies on the highway were to be identified at the outset and there was concern that these might be exacerbated as a consequence of the development, then suitable safeguards could be explored with the developer, such as a S59 Agreement. In my response to the Local Planning Authority, I have recommended that in the event the development is successful, a condition securing a CMP be attached to any planning consent.

3.Suitability of the Downview traffic signals to accommodate the traffic generated by the development and some types of construction vehicles during the construction phase.

The initial LINSIG assessment and re-design of the Downview signals undertaken by the applicants highlighted a number of issues with the workings and timings which were not acceptable to the Highway Authority. As such, they went away and re-assessed both, resulting in a junction arrangement acceptable to the Highway Authority. The initial works proposed included a 'turn with traffic' for those users wishing to turn into Downview Road and Felpham Road. However, the Highway Authority flagged this as a key concern, resulting in the operation of the signals being designed largely as it is now in terms of movements in order to maintain safe operation and flow of traffic through the junction on all the arms. Another key aspect the Highway Authority focussed on was pedestrian activity and movement through the junction, particularly as there are two schools nearby which generate (particularly with regard to the secondary school) large numbers of pupils during school peak periods. The earlier design had prolonged waiting times, whereas the later version has reduced these. And, the junction will also operate using MOVA which can react and adapt to demands placed on it, adjusting waiting times accordingly for traffic and pedestrians alike.

As for construction vehicles, the aforementioned CMP can be adapted to cater for throughput and types of vehicles and their direction of travel. Swept-path analysis has been undertaken with only one turn being problematic for a very large articulated vehicle but of the type that is highly unlikely to need to make that turn anyway (and in fact cannot do at the moment). However, if it is found any adaptations to the junction are required due to vehicle types during the construction phase, then the developer will need to discuss and agree this with the Highway Authority as part of the CMP.

4.Suitability of the Road Safety Audit undertaken for the site access works at the northern end of Downview Road/Golf Links Lane.

As I mentioned previously, an Addendum Note to the Road Safety Audit was provided for the site access works which were amended following the Highway Authority's first round of comments. In the Highway Authority's opinion, both the Audit and the Addendum Note are suitable. In addition to the Audit process, I have visited the site on numerous occasions including school start and finish times and have witnessed high numbers of pedestrians (mainly parents/carers with children) in the locality, a number of which I saw using the N-S foot and cycle path that runs between the new development found to the north and Shirley Drive to the south. Therefore I am well aware of the impact that such users have in the locality and on local roads. Considering all matters – design, road safety and impact on existing and proposed users, the Highway Authority is satisfied that the proposed arrangements for access are suitable.

5.Access by sustainable modes.

Improvements to local PRoW are to be secured from the development, as well as physical measures within the site should planning permission be granted. Local bus stops are also to be improved with improved waiting facilities and real-time passenger information. In addition to this, the County Council has proposals (which have

reached an advanced stage) that include the upgrading of the existing signal crossing on Felpham Way to become a Toucan crossing (between the leisure centre and access and Downview lights) and an upgrading of the N-S path that runs between the leisure centre/school land up to the primary school to provide for walking and cycling. This, coupled with improvements on and around the development site (should planning permission be granted), will provide foot and cycle links between Felpham Village and the new A259.

6. Consideration of proposals on land referred to in the current Arun Local Plan as 'Enterprise' (including LEC airfield) for commercial development including a link road.

The applicant is aware of the proposals set-out in the Arun Local Plan for possible commercial development on the 'Enterprise' land, including the former LEC airfield. As such, they are happy to make available land to deliver part of any link road that might be required to deliver the Enterprise site. This will be secured by S106 Agreement. With regard to traffic impact of that development, there are no specific details of that development, including access configuration. However, TEMPRO does include future development commitments in the Arun Local Plan, including the Enterprise site.

I trust the above assists you.

Should you wish to discuss anything said above or make further representations, then please do not hesitate to contact me. However, please be sure to also copy anything you send to me to the Local Planning Authority marked for the attention of Mr. David Innes who is acting as case officer for this and the planning application for the new golf course proposed off the A259 close to Climping.

Regards,

Tim

Tim Townsend, MCIHT

Principal Transport Planner, County Highways Team – Highways, Transport and Planning
West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RQ

Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk

From: Geoffrey Winch [REDACTED]

Sent: 02 August 2022 14:11

To: Tim Townsend [REDACTED]

Subject: Fwd: FP/274/21/OUT - Bognor Regis Golf Club Proposals - Comments relating to the CHA's Response

****EXTERNAL****

Dear Tim

I am forwarding this original email to you as I'd requested that it be acknowledged, but so far it hasn't. A third party has advised me of your direct email address, so hope this reaches you. I'd be obliged if you would confirm that you have received it.

Thanks,

Geoff Winch

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Geoffrey Winch [REDACTED]

Date: Sun, Jul 31, 2022 at 4:01 PM

Subject: FP/274/21/OUT - Bognor Regis Golf Club Proposals - Comments relating to the CHA's Response

To: [REDACTED] <planning@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED], Simon Wild <[REDACTED]>

Dear Sir or Madam

This email is for the attention of **Tim Townsend** in the Development Control Highways Group. Unfortunately I do not have his dedicated email address and would ask you please, therefore, to forward this to him for his immediate attention. I would be obliged if you would confirm that you have responded to my request - thank you.

I am also copying this email to Arun DC Planning requesting that they upload it on to their application file on the website as I believe it is in the wider public's interest to do so. Again - thank you.

Dear Tim

I would be grateful if you would acknowledge by return that you have received this email.

It is now more than twelve years since we worked together when I was employed as a part-time consultant engineer in the highways development control group at WSCC and, after continuously working for fifty years in the public's interest in matters concerning highways and planning, I decided it was time for me to leave that work behind – as you may recall I had other interests I intended to pursue. So, I have since tried to avoid becoming involved in matters of highways and planning, and had succeeded until faced with the current application to redevelop Bognor Regis Golf Course for housing and this, as you will be aware, landed right on my metaphorical doorstep.

I therefore felt compelled to respond in a way based on my many years of experience and imagined that this would be in a similar vein as your own. My disadvantage these days is that I am not conversant with the various policy documents (national and local) that are in current use, or which particular policies are now employed to determine how a Highway Authority should consider responding to any particular application for development. I anticipated, however, that policies in general, although changing from time to time, would remain broadly based on the same historic principles. Thus, I assume, and I believe I am right in doing so, that the two essential considerations – especially in respect of applications for development such as Bognor Regis Golf Club – are to ensure so far as practicable that safety on the publicly maintainable highway is not prejudiced by traffic generated by the development, and that the traffic generated does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on existing local roads.

As a result I can only express my dismay, shock and considerable concern at your own responses on behalf of the County Highway Authority. Therefore, I am attaching for your perusal my two emailed documents which have formed, thus far, my objections to the development on highway and traffic grounds. These, you will note, are couched in terms of general principles based on those driven by policies that were current during my time. (I note that I made an error in the second email in that I referred to a Section 272 Agreement, and this, of course, should be Section 278).

I would respectfully ask you please to comment on my responses and draw my attention to any matters you disagree with, and your reasons why. I would also appreciate it if you would advise me of the current policy documents and particular policies on which you have made your own responses, and why they differ from those used in the CHA's response to the Site 6 development. I would ask further that you also submit your comments etc to Arun District Council in order that they can put them on the application file on their website – and this I ask as there have been numerous objections to the development, a substantial portion of which have been on highway grounds – and your comments, therefore, should be made

available to the public at large in order that they can understand your reasons not to object or recommend a refusal.

I anticipate that ultimately the application will be determined by the Secretary of State following a Public Inquiry as it will be extremely difficult for Arun DC to grant permission considering the weight of opposition and the fact that the proposals are non-compliant with the current Local Plan. In the event of it going before a Public Inquiry I will make myself available to support and work with objectors to the development in any way I can. In this context, whilst you have raised no objection to the development, I will suggest that there will be a case nevertheless for persuading the Inspector that you should submit a proof of evidence and present this at the Inquiry and, of course, be subjected to cross examination. It will be in the wider public's interest for you to do so. I was required to do this by the Inspector in the case of the Compton Verney Opera House proposals in Warwickshire to which I had raised no objection and provisionally secured a substantial Section 106/278 package but, as Kineton PC had objected on highway grounds, they wished to cross-examine me. (The Secretary of State granted planning permission but this was legally challenged by Kineton PC on the grounds that the applicants had submitted insufficient information in their application – and permission was subsequently withdrawn.)

I am also extremely concerned that you are clearly not applying the same (or broadly similar) policies and principles of securing the means of access to the site as those Duncan Barratt applied when he dealt with the Site 6 application. Again, in my Warwickshire days I was put in the position of having to defend a claim for compensation at an Inquiry by a developer who had been required to finance a large section of the Wellesbourne By-pass when the developers of a similar adjacent development had not. It was a historic case and I hadn't been involved in making the original responses on behalf of the County Council. I managed to defend the case with great difficulty but the Inspector didn't hesitate to make rather derogatory remarks in his report about the CHA's inconsistency and refused our application for costs.

Then in my final two years with Warwickshire I became directly involved with the Blair Government initiative to create Best Value parameters by which Local Authorities should be publicly judged. The ten Midland Shire Authorities established a Best Value Group and I was nominated to chair the Highways Development Control Committee which was comprised of the relevant principal engineers from each authority. The overriding Best Value Factor we established was our ability to demonstrate that we were applying consistent policies and standards when responding to planning applications, not only by case officers working within our individual counties but broadly consistent with local policies across the region. You will no doubt understand, therefore, why I take this matter very seriously.

I send you my regards and look forward to hearing from you soon,

Sincerely

Geoff Winch

65 Downview Road

Felpham

West Sussex

PO22 8JA

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

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.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.
