

Objection to WA/93/20/PL

I object to the application WA/93/20/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. As there has been no full and robust Transport Assessment or Road Safety Audit associated with this updated application 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.

In Ardent's Transport Assessment Addendum document point 2.7 there is an admittance that 'no detailed analysis of this has been taken as part of this TAA' and point 5.1 points the reason to this being the Covid19 pandemic and that 'obtaining up to date traffic data is not possible with significant impacts on travel patterns resulting in current survey results being non-representative of typical operation'. While I agree that any data collected at this time would be misleading it would be negligent to provide rushed approval for such a potentially damaging access to the development before the full impacts are considered as they can be challenged on the policies above.

The access to Tye Lane also goes against the views collected at Wates' public consultation in 2017 where more people stated that they would prefer access on Yapton Lane and where it was stated in the document that there was a need to ensure data was representative of local conditions and that impacts on The Street were properly considered. This updated application fails on these local suggestions.

Furthermore, now that The Grey route for the A27 has been proposed as the preferred route, there are several more housing commitments in the surrounding areas and the level crossing at Yapton Lane has changed traffic numbers significantly it is imperative that an up-to-date Transport Assessment and Road Safety Audit are completed before any permission is given.

The plans provided are very scarce in detail in particular how the proposed emergency exit access on Avisford Park Road will impact on the plans for the development. The agreed reserved plans (WA/95/18/RES) are for an orchard where the access is proposed but there are no detailed plans to see how this will be impacted and no analysis about how it could affect the drainage on site.

There is also very little detail on the emergency gate on Avisford Park Road access. Would this be in place? Will it be locked? If not then it could become a rat run into and exiting the development and

that would lead to major traffic and safety issues along the road itself and onto Yapton Lane. The road is not fit for this level of use, it is a potholed (in places, single vehicle) track and as a resident on this road with a financial responsibility for its upkeep how would I and other residents be recompensed for the potential access? Additionally, as it is a single lane track at points, this leads to regular blocking when larger vehicles are delivering etc. This should be taken into account as it is not a suitable position for an access to emergency vehicles.

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 appreciate that the developers are reluctantly requesting this alternative access due to the announcement of the Grey route but that is not a reason to forgo so many policy, transport and safety issues associated with this updated application. Before such dramatic and long term changes are granted permission there must be adequate and robust assessments.

If planning permission is provided then it should be under the caveat that if the Grey route does go ahead then these access points revert to the ones currently in place.