

[REDACTED]

From: Richard Dollamore [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 January 2020 14:08
To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: 'Gareth Giles' [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL
Importance: High

Dear Simon

Thank you for your email.

We are disappointed that the application is not being returned to February committee, particularly as you said in your email below of 7th January that Neil was happy for this to be done, despite the results of the RSA then being awaited. We are left with no choice but to accept that the application will be considered at March committee and we would like a firm assurance that this will happen. Please can you also confirm that committee members will be appropriately briefed on the benefits of the proposal and risks of refusal on highways grounds. We do not consider it necessary to agree to an extension of time for the application to be considered by March DC Committee.

We have some comments on your proposed conditions, with amendments made the text below:

- Condition 11 is insufficiently precise as drafted and overlaps with Condition 12. The detailed design of the footpath would be covered by the landscape design.
- Condition 12 appears to incorporate elements of an arboricultural condition, which may be best separated from landscape design
- The other issue was that the small lighting units that have been mounted low down on the fence to the side of the access drive would be raised. This would appropriately be addressed through condition 12.

~~(11) No development above damp proof course (DPC) level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority, detailed designs of the alternative footpath to be provided through the grounds of the Inglenook Hotel. The means through which the footpath access in the grounds of the Inglenook Hotel will be made accessible in perpetuity to residents of the new houses should be submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall then be occupied unless and until the alternative footpath and any approved details have been provided.~~

(12) No development above damp proof course (DPC) level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority, a soft and hard landscape design scheme including details of all hard and soft landscape design elements (including hard surfacing to any new/upgraded roadways/footpaths or accesses). The approved planting shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within a period of five years from the completion of development, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Arboricultural condition: and details of existing trees and hedgerows to be retained, together with measures for their protection during the course of the development.

(13) No development above damp proof course (DPC) level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved by the Local Planning Authority, a scheme of signage to alert drivers entering the access from Pagham Road of the potential for pedestrians to be in the road. No part of the development shall be occupied unless and until the approved measures have been provided in full. Thereafter, these features shall be permanently retained in a condition that is fit for purpose.

We have some concerns with your summary of the main points of the Transport Review and consider some of the points to be poorly-reasoned opinions, unrelated to the key question of highways safety. For balance it would be appropriate to show how our highways consultants responded to these and not to present them unchallenged in your report:

- *The location is accessible to convenience goods but for larger goods & services and for work opportunities it is less accessible resulting in a higher reliance on car use than in a town centre location –*
Whilst the site is not located within a town centre, it is located within an established residential area that benefits from a good existing level of accessibility to various local amenities and frequent local bus services. The site's accessibility credentials are therefore entirely appropriate in the context of the area and accord with the relevant tests at paragraph 103 of the NPPF.
- *Parking provision is slightly below demand and this will have a minor impact on Pagham Road –*
The proposed parking provision and layout of the site accords with the projected demands from the WSCC parking demands calculator and will ensure that no displaced parking occurs away from designated parking areas on the site, or outside of the site itself. In any event, it is also noted that the Wilbar report considers that any displaced parking would have only a minor impact on Pagham Road.
- *There were no traffic counts for the existing use of the access to determine the number of vehicles the access is already accommodating for*
There is no 'requirement' for traffic surveys of an existing access' usage to be undertaken. Notwithstanding this, any such survey would likely serve to demonstrate that the access is an established, longstanding access route that operates without issue in any event as evidenced by the road safety records locally. Improvements to the access would be made as part of the proposals, which would more than offset the cumulative impacts of existing and proposed additional users.
- *There does seem to be a trend with collisions at junctions within the area that may present further issues with increased levels of traffic –*
The Transport Statement submitted with the application demonstrates that there are no road safety issues in this locality, with just 3 Personal Injury Accidents identified on this section of Pagham Road across the entire 5-year study period. This is considered to be below the number of accidents that may be expected on a comparable section of public highway over a period of 5 years. Furthermore, no (zero) accidents occurred at the site access, confirming that the site access operates without issue, notwithstanding the improvements that would be delivered as part of the scheme. The proposals would have a negligible impact in terms of increase traffic. This is also confirmed in the Wilbar report at paragraph 5.2.3. The nearest accident occurred over 100 metres from the site access, well outside of the operational area of the access including the associated visibility splays. There have also been no 'clusters' of accidents in any location - which may otherwise indicate inherent issues with particular locations. It is therefore clear that there are no road safety issues in the vicinity of the site.
- *The swept path analysis doesn't take account of any parked vehicles on Pagham Road. There are currently no restrictions and a refuse vehicle would not be able to make a turn with the present arrangements without parking restrictions reducing the existing availability for residents and visitors on-street –*
The swept path analysis submitted with the application at drawing 2017/3763/003 Rev B demonstrates that refuse vehicles would be able to access and egress the site without issue. The double yellow line parking restrictions and presence of the bus stop to the south of the site will ensure that any refuse vehicle manoeuvre to / from the south would be unrestricted. In the event that a vehicle is parked on the eastern side of Pagham Road on the section to the north of the access, a refuse vehicle would still be able to turn in / out of the site towards the north given that the access would be widened as part of the proposals.

- *Manual For Streets (MfS) does suggest that occasional parking in visibility splays is quite common but defined bays should be provided outside visibility splays. The presence of the layby to the north will have a significant impact to the safety with the additional flow expected from the development at peak times.*
Manual for Streets suggests (paragraph 7.8.5) that such incidences of parking in visibility splays do not create issues in practice. The access and layby are longstanding and operate without issue, including in terms of visibility for drivers. The accident records demonstrate that there are no existing safety issues in this locality and the access and its associated visibility splays do not therefore create any issues in-practice. The additional impact of the development traffic would be minimal and, in any event, would be more than offset by the access improvements that would be delivered as part of the scheme. The Wilbar report also confirms at paragraph 5.2.3 that the impact of the development is unlikely to have a detrimental impact to the transport network in the vicinity of the site.
- *It is recommended that a road safety audit is carried out for the access proposals to show that there is no detriment to highway safety or recommend options to make improvements. Although WSCC do not require a road safety audit for developments under 10 units this doesn't take account of the existing use of the site access.*

Whilst the proposals do not meet the threshold for consideration of a Road Safety Audit, it is noted that this has now been commissioned by Arun DC. Any recommendations set out therein would be given due consideration. Notwithstanding the findings of any Road Safety Audit, WSCC are the overseeing organisation that would determine the acceptability of an application in highways and transportation terms.

- *A separate access for pedestrian is proposed at the north of Inglenook Hotel. This is better provision than previous however this is not overlooked and may be vulnerable by users at night who will not feel secure. Further details will be required to review.*

Such pedestrian routes are commonplace and there is no reason that this route would be inherently less secure than any others. Matters relating to lighting, and any other mitigation measures that may be considered necessary in respect to security, are Detailed Design points that can be controlled by way of a Condition associated with any planning approval.

- *The swept path analysis of the narrowest part of the access road is very close to lamp columns and steps with no margin of error –*
The lamp columns would be removed as part of the scheme.
- *It seems 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. –*
As with any planning application, the proposed scheme should be considered on the basis of the plans presented, which have been demonstrated to be suitable in highway and transport terms, notwithstanding any alternative access arrangement that may or may not be achievable.

Kind Regards

Richard

Richard Dollamore



From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 23 January 2020 16:06

To: Richard Dollamore | Whaleback [REDACTED]

Cc: 'Gareth Giles | Whaleback [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Dear Richard,

Sorry, no, it was not possible to get the application back on the agenda. I passed my update report through but the view was that the outcome of the transport review document was such that our members were likely to question why we were still recommending the application for approval and that this would only likely further their previous reservations about the scheme.

I have since had it confirmed that the independent highway consultant does not believe the application should be refused but he states that we should require you to submit details to improve the access in line with the points raised and for this to be the subject of a planning condition.

I am already proposing the following additional/amended conditions which cover some of the points raised:

(11) No development above damp proof course (DPC) level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority, a scheme to show how the alternative footpath through the grounds of the Inglenook Hotel will be provided, promoted, made safe/appealing to users at all times of the day/night and made available in perpetuity to residents of the new houses. No part of the development shall then be occupied unless and until the alternative footpath and any approved security/access/signage/lighting features have been provided.

(12) No development above damp proof course (DPC) level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority, a landscaping scheme including all details of hard and soft landscaping (including hard surfacing to any new/upgraded roadways/footpaths or accesses) and details of existing trees and hedgerows to be retained, together with measures for their protection during the course of the development. The approved details of the landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season, following the

occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from the completion of development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

(13) No development above damp proof course (DPC) level shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority, a scheme of signage/visual measures to alert drivers entering the access from Pagham Road of the potential for pedestrians to be in the road. No part of the development shall be occupied unless and until the approved measures have been provided in full. Thereafter, these features shall be permanently retained as fit for purpose.

However (and noting your comment in the other email about a condition to secure the RSA improvements), I would be grateful for your thoughts on such an additional condition or conditions and what it/they would cover so that I can advise our members of how the concerns are being resolved.

For completeness, my report update summarises the main points of the Transport Review as being:

- *the location is accessible to convenience goods but for larger goods & services and for work opportunities it is less accessible resulting in a higher reliance on car use than in a town centre location;*
- *Parking provision is slightly below demand and this will have a minor impact on Pagham Road;*
- *There were no traffic counts for the existing use of the access to determine the number of vehicles the access is already accommodating for;*
- *There does seem to be a trend with collisions at junctions within the area that may present further issues with increased levels of traffic;*
- *The swept path analysis doesn't take account of any parked vehicles on Pagham Road. There are currently no restrictions and a refuse vehicle would not be able to make a turn with the present arrangements without parking restrictions reducing the existing availability for residents and visitors on-street;*
- *Manual For Streets (MfS) does suggest that occasional parking in visibility splays is quite common but defined bays should be provided outside visibility splays. The presence of the layby to the north will have a significant impact to the safety with the additional flow expected from the development at peak times (particularly if a high sided vehicle is present in the layby);*
- *It is recommended that a road safety audit is carried out for the access proposals to show that there is no detriment to highway safety or recommend options to make improvements. Although WSCC do not require a road safety audit for developments under 10 units this doesn't take account of the existing use of the site access;*
- *A separate access for pedestrian is proposed at the north of Inglenook Hotel. This is better provision than previous however this is not overlooked and may be vulnerable by users at night who will not feel secure. Further details will be required to review;*
- *The swept path analysis of the narrowest part of the access road is very close to lamp columns and steps with no margin of error;*
- *The additional trips are unlikely to have a detrimental impact to the transport network in the vicinity of the site; and*
- *It seems 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.*

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |
Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF
Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk
Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone



CIL is coming
find out more...
www.arun.gov.uk/CIL

Community
Infrastructure
Levy



Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk

Save the environment - think before you print.

From: Richard Dollamore | Whaleback [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 January 2020 11:06

To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Cc: 'Gareth Giles | Whaleback' [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Hi Simon

Are you able to confirm that this application will be considered at the 5th February DC Committee?

Thanks

Richard

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 07 January 2020 12:46

To: Richard Dollamore | Whaleback [REDACTED]

Cc: 'Gareth Giles | Whaleback' [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Inglenook P/58/19/PL

Dear Richard,

We have today instructed Wilbar to undertake the Road Safety Audit which they recommend in their Highway Review. However, I have spoken with Neil and he is happy that we can get the application on the February agenda despite the results of the RSA being awaited.

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department, Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |

Location: Planning, First Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail: simon.davis@arun.gov.uk

Please note that I typically work from home on Thursdays when I am unreachable on my work phone

Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk



Save the environment - think before you print.

<http://www.arun.gov.uk>

DX 57406 Littlehampton

You can view Arun District Council's Privacy Policy from <https://www.arun.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

Important Notice This e-mail is intended exclusively for the addressee and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorised to receive it for the addressee), please notify the sender and delete the e-mail immediately; using, copying, or disclosing it to anyone else, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Any views, opinions or options presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Arun District Council. The information in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, therefore we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this e-mail to a third party. The Council reserves the right to monitor e-mails in accordance with relevant legislation. Whilst outgoing e-mails

are checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee this e-mail is virus-free or has not been intercepted or changed and we do not accept liability for any damage caused. Any reference to "e-mail" in this disclaimer includes any attachments.
