

From: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: 12 January 2021 11:39
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Comment on Planning Application WA/93/20/PL

Please upload onto Ocella the email below and the attachment which is a letter of representation objecting to planning application **WA/93/20/PL**.

Thanks,

Michael

Michael Eastham
Principal Planning Officer,
Planning Department

T: 01903 737772
E: michael.eastham@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk



Sign up to our newsletter [here](#)



From: Michael Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2021 11:30
To: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Comment on Planning Application

Dear Mr Eastham

I am trying to submit the attached objection to WA/93/20/PL.

My word processor returns a character count including spaces of 3,784 but the text is being rejected as over length.

Please advise.

With thanks

Dr Mike Davis
The Street, Walberton BN18 0PJ

I object on the following grounds.

HE requires any impact on the A27 to be mitigated to NIL detriment. Access via Tye Lane fails this requirement by feeding traffic to Fontwell West roundabout which is already over capacity. Applicant's argument, effectively that "one more cigarette won't do any harm", is not sustainable.

TAA is out of date because it does not recognise huge increases in peak flow at Fontwell created by Grey (up to 52% westbound and 78% eastbound).

Unclear if TAA takes into account traffic from the A29 realignment or housing allocations in the Arun Local Plan.

None of the roads feeding development traffic to the A27 are suitable. They were not thought suitable before and they are not suitable now.

TAA 2.7 misdescribes the connection between Grey and Yapton Lane. Wider re-routing of traffic east through Walberton centre is not considered. Re-routing is made more likely by over capacity junctions at Fontwell, themselves made worse by Grey.

There is no prelim design for Grey so exact alignment is unknown and may change during statutory consultation. Grey may not receive a DCO. As there is no need for alternate access before current one is obstructed, application is premature.

HE has told ADC it has "engaged the developers to better understand the potential impact of the proposed scheme on their development. These discussions will also consider the current access to the development and the need for Highways England to ensure that we're able to maintain access to Avisford Grange during construction and upon completion of the scheme." If HE meets its assurance, application is redundant.

Planning Statement says "The approved development cannot now go ahead" and that "ADC cannot fulfil the visions and objectives of its Local Plan and will be under further severe pressure in terms of being unable to meet a 5 year land supply." This disregards HE's assurance to maintain access and that "There should be no direct implications on Arun policies" (Report to Council 13.01.21).

ADC and applicant have been aware of a 5B alignment since 2017. ADC has not given prior public support for 5B and at the 2019 Further Consultation told HE that "There is no support for option 5BV1/Grey". Applicant also submitted evidence against Grey. ADC should reject the application and work with the developer and other affected parties in opposing Grey.

HE published a Scheme Assessment Report (SAR) misrepresenting ADC's position. Para 17.11.3.3 states "Option 5BV1 has better support from WSCC and Arun DC").

ADC and HE were alerted to the misrepresentation on 23.11.20. While no action has been taken by either party to instate a truthful SAR and this is detrimental to Walberton, ADC has "put this on a Council agenda as soon as possible to get the backing of the Council for the preferred route Grey, whilst seeking full mitigation for Walberton and Binsted". A resolution to welcome Grey will be debated on 13.01.21.

ADC has not defined full mitigation and cannot without consulting affected communities (not done) and without access to a prelim design for Grey (not available). ADC also fails to recognise the adverse impact of Grey on Fontwell or that impacts elsewhere are understated.

Whatever definition of full mitigation may be decided, it cannot be met by consenting this application which produces the opposite effect of increasing the already high adverse impact of Grey on Walberton.

Any resolution modifying ADC's long standing position (ie No support for Grey) appears to create a conflict of interest in considering this and future applications. ADC is also subject to remaining

influence of a bilateral Memorandum of Understanding agreed by Cabinet with Arundel Town Council but excluding Walberton. This also may engage consideration of the application.