

Sandra Edwards

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 08 November 2017 08:48
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: IMPORTANT: Evidence of deception in transport Assessment for WA/73/17/OUT

From: Daniel Vick **On Behalf Of** Juan Baeza
Sent: 07 November 2017 16:20
To: Planning.Responses
Subject: FW: IMPORTANT: Evidence of deception in transport Assessment for WA/73/17/OUT

Please upload as a rep on WA/73/17/OUT

From: Ren Kitchener [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 November 2017 21:38
To: stephen.gee@westsussex.gov.uk; Juan Baeza; Cllr. Norman Dingemans [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Karl Roberts [REDACTED]
Subject: IMPORTANT: Evidence of deception in transport Assessment for WA/73/17/OUT

Dear Juan Baeza,

Complaint about the transport assessment for WA/73/17/OUT - Welbeck at Wandleys.

The TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT APPEDIX B-G does recognise and accept the dangers of the entrance to this site, and has made suggestions on how to mitigate the issues, with examples.

However, it is clear to me that this assessment document has been 'tailored' to satisfy the 'paying' client in this case. Certainly, it has incorrect assumptions, and focus, intended to mislead the planning officers, and the public, into considering one part of the road that is insignificant, whilst masking another part that is more relevant and more significant. There are also other examples of how this assessment is misleading.

Here are my arguments to support my accusation:

The least significant point, but still very relevant:

If you look at the assessment's drawings, they have deliberately shown large articulated lorry positions, sourced from an access restricted part of the lane, South of the entrance, and accessing the Site.

This is to 'illustrate' how 'safe' and substantially 'wide' the lane will be, which in fact, will require significantly more hedgerow/treeline clearing than that indicated or allowed (Dandara are to maintain their tree-line in accordance with the Inspector's conditions, and Welbeck have stated that they need to preserve most of theirs, to satisfy the Ecology requirements).

So the most characteristic part of the lane's distinct rural identity must be totally cleared of the overhead tree canopy at that part, to accommodate their recommendations.

It is perfectly clear that the South side of the entrance does not comprise a wide dual lane road as shown. It's specifically a single lane, which they have **NOT** shown. So their drawings only show what they wish you to see, over a few metres, in order to uphold the assessment's claims:

In 'reality', the short Southern part of the lane is fed from a narrow single lane, with two obscured entrances from properties specifically not shown, which means to say that **ALL** northbound traffic will have very little time or inclination to transfer or shift to the left hand side of the lane at that point. Signage will not help, because they would have to be placed downstream of the two opposing entrances on the south side of the Welbeck entrance - otherwise it could confuse the drivers as to which entrance it is trying to make them avoid.

Barn Farm is the most used entrance (tractors and farm equipment, horses, services and deliveries), so it would be safer at that point to use the right side of the lane (which is more central-right), then in only a few meters, they will have to rapidly shift to the left hand side of the lane, which is not possible for that short distance. So there is no chance of collision avoidance even with a wider section at that entrance, because the distance is too short for traffic to shift lane position in time. *We have a recorded accident at this point between the two opposing entrances too.*

The south side of the entrance will still be obscured by the trees and hedges that Welbeck are preserving in accordance with their ecology statement. So this will introduce an added danger, and not solve collision avoidance, where the assessment contradicts the Welbeck Ecology statement.

The most important point:

The drawings do not show a foot path or cycle lane immersing from the South side of the entrance:

WITHOUT ANY DOUBT, both school children from the development and school-run traffic **WILL** exclusively use the southern part of the lane, **NOT** the northern improved part as assumed in this assessment.

This is because for access to the A29 and for getting to Bognor Regis, as well as getting to the **FOUR** major schools and primary schools in Eastergate, Barnham and Aldingbourne, this south section of the lane is the shortest, easiest, quickest and most unrestricted (speed) route to take, for this development and for other developments in Fontwell.

This southern route is **NOT** improved whatsoever, and it is a single narrow lane with no footpaths, cycle lane, lighting, speed control and it has poor visibility due to the overhead tree canopies (which also makes it a very slippery lane, which is also prone to flooding - this is supported by photographic evidence). It has two very narrow blind bends where 'near misses' are so regular that it is a miracle.

Therefore, their improved northern route has **absolutely NO benefit**, and therefore it **MUST** be discounted as a solution for this application. It's clear that the survey is incomplete, with no clear conclusion based on the real use-model for both Children, Traffic and other lane users such as Horses, cyclists and Dog-walkers.

This is exactly the same as saying: "We've added a safety switch to our electrical equipment so that we can obtain BSi Low Voltage approval, but the switch has no function" Would this get approval? **NO!** Not even with a warning label! So it would be useless trying to convince the development to use the northern route by putting up a sign! That suggestion would demonstrate ignorance.

Finally:

The Police refuse to allow SpeedWatch volunteers to monitor this lane for speeding traffic (this is a known problem for this lane, and there is evidence to validate the Police's assessment) - even with HiViz Vests,

because it is assessed as being too dangerous. Therefore, if this transport assessment does not address the above arguments, then it is certainly being ignorant of the dangers.

The transport assessment should be more substantial, accurate and include future predictions i.e. the Dandara development, the A29 realignment and the Fontwell roundabout traffic control impact on the use of the lane.

Conclusion:

As Mr. Karl Roberts once said to me, in so many words, fool me once, shame on you, fool me twice, shame on me - and I've never been able to fool Mr Roberts ever since, and I've not tried to either: In this case, it is clear to me that other assessments and reports for other topics could also be approached in the same way. So I would prefer that all the critical surveys were conducted again by other appointed third parties.

However, at the very least, this transport assessment should be 'thrown-out' (the traffic count is also too low anyway).

Kindest regards,

Ren Kitchener.