

Church View

Summer Lane, Nuetimber, West Sussex. PO21 4NQ.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

24th August, 2015

Planning Dept.
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex BN17 5LF



Dear Sir/Madam

Re Planning Application: P/58/15/OUT

We emailed our objection to this application on 20th August from above email address.

You have included our email online under 'REP LETTERS', but unfortunately the images within that email, which are a fundamental part of the rejection, were NOT included.

Therefore we have printed the letter again, with all images complete.

Please therefore scan the enclosed and REPLACE our original online with this, INCLUDING ALL THE IMAGES.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and enclosure either by letter or email to above.



Paul & Carol Chase

ENC

20th August 2015

We strongly oppose above application for the following reasons:

1. Totally Impractical

This proposal would be totally impractical, and furthermore unsafe for a number of reasons:

90 homes have the potential to produce in excess of 180 additional vehicles accessing Summer Lane, in both directions. See Appendix F below.

Summer Lane does not have capacity to take additional vehicles for the following reasons:

(i) The plan provides for relocation of the footpath to the north side.

This change does not then provide suitable safe width for the properties at the entrance to Summer Lane on the south side of the redesigned road. See Appendix A below

(ii) The alteration then introduces consequences for visibility from the accesses for those south side existing dwellings. See Appendix B below

(iii) **Site Access Plan Drawing N0.120843/A/11**

The plan indicates on both sides of the road there will still be protected on-street parking.

Cars are currently parked in existing bays nearly always. This constantly reduces the access/exit to Summer Lane to effectively single lane access.

We would urge all concerned parties to view this site for themselves to form their own intelligent judgment on the capacity of the (albeit modified) entrance to take the required traffic (see picture 1 below).

Picture 1 (Google Street View)



(iv) Access for large commercial Refuse & Service Vehicles

Refuse is collected weekly.

General recycling is collected fortnightly.

On the alternate weeks, grass recycling is also collected fortnightly.

These large, wide collection lorries go right to the end of the existing housing, parking all the way down, and on the single-track un-adopted part of Summer Lane.

These are large commercial vehicles, which block even the two-way traffic section of Summer Lane.

(See picture 2 & 3 below) taken at the widest part of Summer Lane

(Picture 2)



(Picture 3)



(See picture 4 & 5 below) taken at the narrower parts of Summer Lane
(Picture 4) (Picture 5)



Sewage Treatment Tankers

Additionally, extra-large sewage tankers service the sewage treatment works at the very end of Summer Lane. These are a similar width to above example, and also block the road as above. These extra-large sewage tankers service the treatment works on numerous occasions daily, the frequency increasing during inclement weather.

Large Tractors & other agricultural vehicles use this lane frequently throughout the year to service the adjacent farmland. Their size alone also blocks the road as above (see pictures 2,3,4, & 5).

ALL these commercial vehicles block the road completely, making it impossible for any traffic to pass, let alone **essential emergency service vehicles** (e.g. Fire engines, ambulance etc.) – access to ALL vehicles is denied whilst the lane is being serviced by all of the above.

(v) Site Access Plan Drawing N0.120843/A/11

The yellow 'no parking' lines indicated around the east access point will not prevent parking by cars displaying blue badges. Cars so parked in these narrow sections of Summer Lane will simply add to the burden and consequential chaos caused by additional significant traffic volumes. The same applies to cars illegally parked on yellow lines. With additional cars and limited parking in the immediate area serving the local shops, it will only exacerbate illegal parking.

(vi) Parts of the revised road width will be too tight for safe traffic flows especially in regard to daily large commercial vehicles referred above, plus emergency services. See Appendix C below

(vii) Alterations may be needed to property owners' driveways, which are unlikely to be approved, and are outside the control of the applicant and the Local Highway Authority (LHA). See Appendix D below

(viii) Additionally, just before the lane narrows, there is an **Electricity Sub-Station, which is in close proximity to the narrowing road** and by definition adds an additional level of risk to safety were there to be a traffic accident, the likelihood of which is increased with the additional volume of traffic. The plan includes removing the pavement in front of this, with the added consequent risks to safety.

(See picture 6 & 7 below)

(Picture 6)



(Picture 7)



The substantially increased number of vehicles having to use Summer Lane will cause major traffic jams, which will be exacerbated disproportionately when Summer Lane is frequently (blocked daily as above) by a mix of large service & agricultural vehicles etc.

Consider the above scene at school 'rush hour' in the morning, which coincides with ALL above service vehicles, and with the additional cars from 90 houses attempting to negotiate the above (albeit) slightly altered entrance/exit, and the consequential effects on traffic flows in Pagham Road when waste, general recycling, garden recycling, sewage treatment vehicles and tractors are operating. This would be positively dangerous.

The difference school traffic makes can clearly be judged by comparing the difference schools make to the volumes of traffic and consequent queues going into Chichester when schools are in or out.

(ix) "Trip Generation & Highway Capacity"

a. The calculations are incorrect. **See Appendix E**

The LHA had advised the parameters should be "revisited and revised", but the "The system that challenges and validates assumptions about the transport impacts of new developments" (TRICS ®) parameters referred to have NOT been revised making the calculations wrong, and incorrectly favour the applicant/s of this Planning Application.

b. A recent survey (2013) showed the average household in Britain has two cars. **See Appendix F**

If 90 additional houses were to be built all accessing Summer Lane exclusively in both directions, the traffic volumes generated by 180 additional vehicles can be seriously anticipated. Even with the modifications it can be seen Summer Lane simply could not take this additional volume of traffic.

2.

The owners of the houses to the north side of the un-adopted part of Summer Lane are all responsible for the maintenance of the surface and repair of the road in front of their own properties.

This proposal would increase their burden of responsibility, which would not be acceptable, and would be blocked.

3.Re: APPLICATION SUBSTITUTED 10.7.15

(i) Refers to "some matters reserved".

We reject the application until these 'matters' are defined and stated clearly for ALL to see and judge accordingly.

(ii) Point 10 states zero car-parking onsite.
This clearly conflicts with the plan

(iii) Page 24 SITE VISIT

Answers 'No' to "can the site be seen from a public footpath"

This is WRONG – it can be seen from at least two public footpaths and probably the main Pagham Road also.

Consequently, given all of the above and the significant issues with safety, we totally reject Planning Application P/58/15/OUT off Summer Lane.

Paul & Carole Chase.
Church View
Summer Lane
Nyetimber
Bognor Regis
West Sussex.
PO21 4NQ.

Appendix A

"There are two problems that the

LHA consider need further investigation.

The first relates to clearance to boundary features on the southern side of Summer Lane with the proposed scheme including no margin to existing features. It is normal practice to provide clearance of 450mm (300mm absolute minimum) to features alongside the carriageway to ensure these are not struck. Such clearance would appear achievable in certain locations where the carriageway widens to over 5 metres. The designer is recommended to revisit the design to determine if a margin can be provided along the southern side of Summer Lane. Depending on the outcome of this, the LHA may need to consider an exception report".

Ian Gledhill

Appendix B

"The arrangement shown would also involve relocating the existing narrow footway from the southern side of Summer Lane to the north. In principle, there would be benefit to this given the widening of the footway that would result. Removing the footway from the southern side of the carriageway may have consequences for visibility from the accesses for those existing dwellings. It would appear that visibility may be substandard based on the existing arrangements, the proposed works would potentially worsen matters. Again, this matter should be appropriately considered with it determined how much of an impact would result from relocating the footway".

Ian Gledhill

Appendix C

"The access road widths leading into the development differ between the east and west access points; the east access appears shown as 4.2 metres whilst the western access is nearly 6 metres. It is recommended that a consistent width of at least 4.8 metres is achieved at both access points. Visibility splays are also only shown at the western access looking east; visibility splays would need to be shown at both junctions in both directions".

"In order to achieve a consistent 1.8 metre wide footway, the carriageway width is shown reduced below 4.8 metres over distance of approximately 40 metres. The width would vary over this but at the narrowest the carriageway would be 4.1 metres. Manual for Streets suggests that this width is adequate to enable two cars to pass at slow speed. However this is still particularly tight. The narrowest location is also in the immediate vicinity of the eastern access".

Appendix F

Average household in Britain has two cars, according to a new survey by Direct Line

Reference: <http://www.gloucestershireecho.co.uk/Average-household-Britain-cars-according-new/story-20257863-detail/story.html#ixzz3inNrMnGq>

"While the average household in Britain has two cars (47 per cent), new figures suggest that over 2.2 million (six per cent) households have four or more cars on the same driveway.

Analysis of car insurance policies by Direct Line has found that less than one in three people (30 per cent) are 'single-car households', while another 16 per cent have three cars at the same home".