

Updated Objection to WA/63/21/PL

I object to the application WA/63/21/PL on several grounds.

When the development was given outline planning it was on the basis of policies within the NPPF, Arun's emerging local plan/saved policies and Walberton's Neighbourhood Development Plan. It cannot be stated with any certainty that adherence to the following policies has been sufficiently met with this updated application to WA/44/17/OUT and WA/95/18/RES:

- The application fails Paragraph 32 of the NPPF which states that: 'Safe and acceptable access is provided for all people' and 'There will not be a severe, residual, cumulative transport impact of the development'.
- The NP policy GA5 resists proposals that increase traffic flows to the villages, its likely increase to traffic in The Street will also detrimentally impact on Walberton's Conservation Area.
- Arun's Local Plan policy GEN4 that any development 'does not materially add to existing road congestion and air pollution'. It goes further to state that before granting permission, the Local Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that any identified potential travel problems arising from a proposal will be resolved. I do not believe that this satisfaction can be resolved with the significant lack of detail in this application.

Regardless of traffic surveys, conducted during a pandemic when traffic movements cannot be representative, this change will certainly materially add to existing road congestion through Walberton village and is therefore against Policy GEN4. It will also provide a severe cumulative transport impact which is against Paragraph 32 of the NPPF and as Tye Lane is an unsafe road this will also bring safety issues for residents. The application also fails to take into account the potential A27 grey route and provides no mitigation for the cumulative effects of traffic if this route goes ahead.

As Arun's refusal for WA/68/20/OUT (opposite to the application location on Tye Lane) was based upon insufficient information on the potential impacts to the strategic road network. Furthermore, the refusal states *"the preferred route for the A27 Arundel Bypass: the Grey Option 5BV1 route would be constructed in close proximity to the north of the proposed development, which would have the effect of stopping up Tye Lane to the north of the development. The Fontwell West roundabout is already over capacity as it is severely impacted by traffic in the peak periods and accordingly any additional traffic on top of already severe conditions are in themselves classed as severe. The applicant has not demonstrated that their impacts on the A27 are mitigated to a NIL detriment. Consequently, insufficient information has been submitted to determine whether or not the proposal complies with Policy T SP1 of the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework"*.

As this application is requesting access to the same road (Tye Lane) has also not demonstrated how it will mitigate the severe impacts it should be refused.

The argument put forward by Vistry is that due to the impending plans for the A27 Grey Route, there is a necessity to apply for alternative access on Tye Lane yet they then request that these impending plans be ignored to allow for the update to the Tye Lane and A27 modifications to get planning permission. If Arun's planning department are being requested to ignore the Grey route plans for this application then they have an obligation to ignore the need for the new application as the existing permission for access onto Yapton Lane should maintain its validity.

The planning application still includes the access onto Yapton Lane as well as access onto Tye Lane and emergency access onto Avisford Park Road, therefore it is applying for 3 access points to the development. There has not been adequate traffic modelling to consider how 2 main accesses would function (Yapton Lane and Tye Lane) if this application is given permission.

On the 21st July 2021 we received a leaflet through the post from Vistry detailing the necessity for this application but this hardly constitutes fuller community consultation. In the leaflet it is claimed that Vistry/Linden's engineers have conducted extensive highways assessments which suggest that Tye Lane is capable of taking extra vehicle movements but this is literally on the basis that Tye Lane has access to the A27 which with the Grey Route it will not. It suggests that continuing access onto the A27 alone will route traffic away from the village yet the whole reason for this application is due to the Grey route cutting off both Yapton Lane access to the site AND will cut off access from Tye Lane onto the A27. Until details of full mitigation of excess traffic if Tye Lane is cut off from the A27 then this application should be refused as detailed in the refusal for WA/68/20/OUT.

There are serious drainage issues around the proposed Tye Lane access as detailed by Laura Gibbons at Arun and these have not been properly addressed with this application.

The plans propose emergency access on Avisford Park Road but it is clear that the applicants have neglected to research the details as it proposes and implies that there is access from both directions yet Avisford Park Road is a narrow, potholed cul-de-sac and therefore only has one, single lane access. The road is unadopted with residents responsible for its upkeep, it is often blocked by parked cars and delivery vehicles. It is also periodically closed to vehicles for community events. The bollard that is proposed will not stop use by motorbikes and this could impact on the safety of the footpath and the access onto Yapton Lane. The proposed access road will detrimentally impact on the orchard and the root system of the Oak trees. This is a material change to the application.

Moreover, in an email from Linden's previous Associate Planner on 9th April 2019, Laura Humphries states that *'there is no planning requirement for any emergency access at all'* to the site and goes further in detailing a Persimmon site in Littlehampton for 600 homes that only has one access point and no emergency access.

I would also like to comment and advise that it is helpful to have the correct spelling when putting a planning application in, Walberton is referred to as Walburton and Avisford Park Road is referred to as Avisford Grange Road. It is not a material point of refusal but it shows the lack of detail and accuracy in this application.