

[REDACTED]

From: Simon Davis
Sent: 07 January 2020 17:39
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

[REDACTED]

From: Richard Dollamore [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 January 2020 14:36
To: Simon Davis [REDACTED]
Cc: 'Gareth Giles | Whaleback' [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Dear Simon

Thank you for your update.

I understand that you have also been in touch with Jamie Brown of WSCC Highways, who will provide an update to their consultation response following the Wilbar Associates review, RSA and the recent design amendments. Our transport consultants, RGP, will also review these document and advise whether it is beneficial for any further changes to be undertaken.

It is noted that this application did not meet the WSCC policy requirements for an RSA and we have some concerns about whether this is reasonable and proportionate, given that WSCC as statutory authority raised no objection. We are, though, encouraged that the application will be considered at February committee and trust that the authority will work positively and proactively to enable any issues to be addressed.

Although I will leave it to the professional highways experts to provide their responses to the Wilbar review, I have the following initial comments:

1. The report states that 'a refuse vehicle would not be able to make a turn with the present arrangements without parking restrictions.' However, this does not appear to be correct. The turn would not be possible if it was made on the same radius but it is clear that a tighter turning circle can be achieved. i.e. if a vehicle can turn left out of the site onto the north-bound carriageway then it can also turn right (from a position in the middle of the road, to the right of any parked vehicles) into the site.
2. In 5.1.2 the report refers to Manual for Streets 2 with regards to visibility splays. However, MfS2 states that 'It has often been assumed that failure to provide visibility at priority junctions in accordance with the values recommended by MfS1 will result in an increased risk of injury collisions. Research carried out by TMS Consultancy for MfS2 has found no evidence of this.' Section 10.5 of MfS2 discusses the measurement of X and Y distances and concludes that: 'based on the research referred to above, unless there is local evidence to the contrary, a reduction in visibility below recommended levels will not necessarily lead to a significant problem.' Vehicle speeds along this stretch of Pagham Road are low, with any parking on the east side also causing vehicles to slow down further.
3. The report states that 'There does seem to be a trend with collisions at junctions within the area that may present further issues with increase levels of traffic.' This does, however, appear to be an entirely non-empirical assessment, particularly as there is no indication that the accidents by Nyetimber Lane or Hook Lane were a result of reduced visibility. Indeed, with respect to the MfS2 statement above, the accidents may have been more likely as a result of the increased confidence drivers have when in a highways environment with high levels of visibility.
4. The consultant's request that a RSA is undertaken appear to serve the interests of the consultants, rather than applicants or planning authority. It is again noted that this development does not meet the WSCC

policy requirements for an RSA to be undertaken. We are conscious that RSAs are designed to highlight issues (which may be identified in relation to any development) but the identification of issues does not mean that an application should be considered negatively. Risks can be identified in any aspect of our shared environment and it is the constant assessment and appraisal of risks that make for a safe environment. Like the argument in relation to visibility, the elimination of evident risks can make places less safe as individuals become less alert and more complacent. This is the basis of the Hans Monderman approach to street design, which informed MfS2 and is more appropriate to a built-up village context than standard engineered solutions.

5. The report questions whether pedestrians using the proposed path to the north side of the Inglenook would feel secure. However, paths and twittens are a characteristic feature of West Sussex towns and villages and there is no reason to question why this path would be any less secure than any others. Details of low level lighting may be provided by condition.
6. The report refers to the swept path being 'very close to lamp columns and steps with no margin of error.' However, the columns are proposed to be removed.
7. The report states that 'It does seem poor planning to construct two separate access roads adjacent to each other when one could serve the same purpose and reduce the impact on Pagham Road and the safety concerns raised.' The issues relating to ransom strips have been explained to ADC, which effectively prevent access from being obtained from the development to the south through this planning application. However, should planning permission be obtained, the ransom strips would no longer be the only means of gaining access so they would not be able to take such a high proportion of the uplift value. The probability of obtaining access from the development to the south therefore increases if this application is approved.

Kind Regards

Richard

Richard Dollamore

WHALEBACK

