

4 Norfolk Place, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5PD

Ms A Gardner
Planning Department
Arun District Council
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
BN17 5LF

Dear Ms Gardner,

LU/252/15/PL
LU/253/15/PL
LU/255/15/PL
118-120 Wick Street, Littlehampton

Further to Mr Ware of the Applicant Company calling you, he has instructed me to provide some perspective sketches in respect of Application number LU/252/15/PL, indicating what is being proposed at the Beaconsfield Road side of the site, and how it relates to the existing terraces opposite and on the same side of the road north of the site, I confirm I shall try to provide these in the next few days.

There have been a number of representations from residents of nearby houses in respect of these three applications, some making claims or allegations that do need answering so that they don't mistakenly come to be taken as facts by anyone reading the correspondence.

There are clearly access problems along the street, which are largely due to the amount of on-street parking, aggravated by high traffic flow at start and end of the school day. Some of the complaints raised for this Application, and the earlier one, were actually comments on traffic problems that already existed.

In spite of some of the letters suggesting this proposal will simultaneously decrease the amount of available parking and increase the number of vehicles parking on the street, the proposal includes sufficient off-street parking to serve the proposed development, and does not reduce the length of kerb available for on-street parking. In fact, the length of kerb available for parking would increase by around 4 metres due to the new vehicle entrance being narrower than the existing entrance splay.

The asbestos cement garage referred to was dismantled without damaging the sheeting, which is now stored on site and will eventually be transported off site and disposed of in full compliance with the Asbestos Regulations. Asbestos-Cement, as I'm sure you know, does not require any more specialised treatment than careful handling to minimise fibre release and proper disposal at an approved facility. The HSE give this type of work as an example of **non-licensed work with asbestos:** *asbestos cement products, (eg roof sheeting and rainwater goods) provided the material is carefully handled/removed without breaking up; this includes work with asbestos cement which is weathered but not otherwise substantially damaged*

Since reading the representations and discussing them with the Applicant, I have revisited the site, because the statement that a machine struck and damaged the power distribution pole needed to be investigated as a potential hazard to Health and Safety in case it had left the pole in a dangerously weakened state. The Applicant stated he was unaware of any such damage occurring. The Pole is outside the site, and exposed to general traffic. I could not see any signs of recent damage to the pole, although I observed it is old with some decay near ground level. The pole is more or less vertical with no indication of it being displaced. If building work were being carried out on the Application Site, the cables would be taped, and overhead hazard warnings erected. The cables are outside the site and high enough for normal construction traffic to pass under.

Reference is also made to the cobble walling, which is about 75cm tall. Nothing has been found in searches to suggest it is Listed, or that it is in a Conservation Area. However, no damage whatever has been inflicted by the garden clearance work, only timber fencing erected on top of the wall has been removed. All the same, part of the wall would need to be removed to implement the proposed scheme, in order to form the vehicle entrance, as clarified on the attached plan. No more than 5.5 metres would be removed from a total length of more than 19 metres. The Applicant is willing to extend the length of the wall at the south of vehicle entrance to compensate, which could total of around 9 metres of new cobble-work, with a gap for a pathway.

On the other hand the Applicant points out that there would be an opportunity to help access along the road if the wall were removed, because some form of pavement could be formed to allow people to park very close to the kerb and still open their car doors, which the wall prevents at the moment. This is of no benefit to the developer, who would prefer to keep the wall as part of the landscaped area, but the residents seem divided on which is the greater evil, road congestion or loss of the flint wall.

The Applicant confirms that a bonfire was lit at 10am one working day, to dispose of green waste and old timber that was on site. The fire was well away from the Classified Highway and from the carriageway of Beaconsfield Road, and was fully extinguished at the end of the day. There was no intervention of any kind by the Police.

Finally, the letters give the impression that the garden clearance work resulted in repeated and prolonged obstruction of Beaconsfield Road. The Applicant feels this gives an untrue picture as the obstruction only occurred on two occasions, and was caused by the limited access at the start of the operation that was improved radically as soon as the fences at the existing access had been removed. The Applicant is adamant the obstruction was minimal, a matter of ten minutes each to offload two machines, which is much less than the forty minutes allowed by law. The Applicant agrees that any obstruction is highly inconvenient, but best efforts were made to reduce to a minimum the time taken to offload.

Littlehampton has of course been blighted by obstructions to pavements and reduced access to businesses caused by major building work in recent years, particularly in Terminus Road and Arundel Road. The scale of this proposal is much smaller, would persist for a much shorter time, and would not block-off any businesses. If the proposed vehicle access and carpark is made usable early in the building programme, it should be possible to reduce obstruction at least below what is caused by car parking at the present time.

I would be grateful if you will place copies of this letter in the three files.

Yours truly,



R.Brown
24th September 2015