

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maitravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk
Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to
www.arun.gov.uk/planning and click on Local Planning Application Find



From: Peter Youatt [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 August 2021 06:45
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: WA/63/21/PL: Land East of Tye Lane walberton

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

I wish to register an objection to this application. I have read and agree with the objection of Walberton Parish Council.

The application is inconsistent and premature. It was Tweedledee who remarked 'if it was so, it might be; and if it were so, it would be; but as it isn't, it ain't. That's logic.' This application seeks to deal with a situation which at the moment 'isn't' and therefore 'ain't' and, as it acknowledges, may well never be. A 'flier' to some residents from Linden/Vistry (the applicant) invited them to comment or raise questions. They were apparently ignored if they did. In the flier the applicant confirmed that it would 'continue to engage with Highways England and if other workable access arrangements are put forward to Avisford Grange then we would be happy to discuss these with them' and 'that this situation is not one of Linden Homes' choosing and we would not be pursuing an alternative access point were it not for the proposed route of the A27 by-pass'.

It may not be of its choosing but it is certainly of its making. Although no 'preferred route' decision had been announced the Grey route was in the public domain before the applicant, allegedly relying on an assurance from WSCC that it would never be chosen, commenced construction; it could have waited until the route was announced.

If in the future certain things, as yet undecided, happen then its existing entrance **might** have to be closed. In making its argument for this alternative entrance the applicant, inconsistently, assumes that the existing consented entrance in Yapton Lane **will be** closed but that Tye Lane **will** remain open to northbound traffic. The applicant's wish for 'certainty' is commercial. That is not a material planning consideration.

In refusing WA/68/20/OUT ADC said the Grey Route 'would have the effect of stopping up Tye Lane to the north of the development'. It is now being asked to consider this application on the basis that Tye Lane will remain open to the north.

WSCC in its response states: 'The application considers the impacts in a non Arundel bypass scenario'. How can this be? It is real Tweedledee. WSCC and ADC surely cannot assume one basis for their decision for one application but another for another?

The Yapton Lane entrance was part of the original application and access was, rightly, not a reserved matter. Access from Tye Lane was investigated at that time and rejected as unsuitable. All previous traffic assessments on Tye Lane, including for this site and the unsuccessful (on *inter alia* precisely this point) application on the land to the west of Tye Lane (WA/68/20 OUT) have reached the same conclusion.

The Street is not capable of taking a traffic increase. There is parking in the Street not only, and reasonably, by some residents but at the relevant times by those dropping and collecting children from the School and all day by those working at commercial premises (e.g. Booker's Yard) in the Street that have inadequate on-site parking. At times the Street is in effect a single track road. It is not a through route in the way some village streets are. In making the original application, using the Yapton Lane entrance, the applicant said only 5% of traffic from the site would use the Street. If Tye Lane is closed to traffic going north (as HE have suggested and ADC previously accepted) 100% of that traffic will use the Street and even if (despite what HE currently say) it is not then on the applicant's own figures 35% will. We are back with Tweedledee.

The applicant claims it seeks only an **alternative** entrance; it is not intending to implement it even if granted. ADC would presumably therefore have to impose pre-commencement, and possibly 'Grampian', conditions. If not dealt with more tightly than the present situation permits this could result in two accesses where only the existing access is needed.

Peter Youatt
Lansdown House
Walberton
Arundel
BN18 0PG
[REDACTED]