

-----Original Message-----

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

Please upload onto Ocella the email below which is a further objection from a local resident 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](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2021 10:46
To: Michael Eastham <Michael.Eastham@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: WA/93/20/PL

Dear Michael

Please would you publish the following as an objection to WA/93/20/PL.

With thanks

Mike Davis
The Street
Walberton, West Sussex

Please treat these comments as supplementary to OWPC32785 and as an objection to application WA/93/20/PL.

As Grey has no formal planning status, for planning purposes it has been treated as never going to happen and still is. The Arun Transport Study 2016 Stage 3 treats as certain that the Arundel Bypass will not rejoin the existing A27 west of Yapton Lane. This certainty is carried forward in the WSCC/ADC Local Plan Transport Mitigation Apportionment Study which was published in June 2020.

Document ref 183248: Traffic Flow Diagram: Fontwell West - HE Assessment purports to offer a transport assessment of junction capacity at Fontwell West if Grey is delivered. However, it obtains its data from the Arun Transport Study 2016 Stage 3 which is certain that Grey will never happen. It is therefore unfit for purpose.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no other version of the WSCTM or any other transport assessment covering Fontwell West that does consider that Grey will happen. If both the status and therefore planning treatment of Grey are unchanged since permission for the development was granted, modifying either for the purpose of this application would be arbitrary and un-evidenced.

It should be noted and addressed that none of the above is discoverable in the documentation provided by the applicant and has to be sought by independent investigation.

Furthermore, the drawings in document refs CSA/3823/110 REVN and Proposed alternative access 003 B indicate the applicant's intention to retain access to the development at Yapton Lane as well as securing new access at Tye Lane and new emergency access at Avisford Park Road. The application is therefore for additional and multiple access points, not for alternate access as purported.

In December 2020, the Director of Major Projects, Highways England undertook to "engage 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" (1).

The applicant has not disclosed any aspect of the outcome of those discussions, including why Highways England cannot meet its clear commitment to maintain access and, therefore, why the application is necessary.

Moreover, Highways England is engaged in ongoing discussions with other stakeholders to incorporate design improvements and to mitigate the effects of Grey. On the evidence of this application, Highways England's commitment "to better understand the potential impact of the proposed scheme on their development" appears limited to demanding that the applicant obtains and uses data that Highways England cannot itself provide and which is obsolete and misleading.

In summary, the application is premature, unnecessary, insufficiently and unreliably evidenced, wanting for transparency, presented as seeking additional rather than alternate access, and based on a transport model and assessment that is unfit for purpose. It should be comprehensively rejected.

Any further application should not be accepted for consideration before these issues are remedied and unless and until Highways England has obtained planning consent for an Arundel Bypass that irreversibly obstructs current access to the development.

More broadly, an approach to planning that has disregarded a route alignment for the Arundel Bypass that has been "a long time coming, some 35 years since the Poling-Crossbush section" (2) and which has been clearly identified as an option since at least 2017 (3) might also usefully be reviewed in order to prevent similar problems in the future.

1. Letter from Mr Peter Mumford, Highways England to Cllr James Walsh, Arun District Council, 3 December 2020.

2. Cllr James Walsh, Leader Arun District Council.

https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.arun.gov.uk%2fnews-archive%2froute-for-new-arundel-bypass-announced-2472&c=E,1,WYHbldlY7aK3OMLmJO50OwW4MSIRa6dYubZC4nSdwZFeCo4-TS4V3pU9DCAp7XeU_4xRBKuz0nXS95f094atf0Yi8By94-oYzcUnUS__9g,,&typo=1

3. A27 Arundel Bypass PCF Stage 1 - Technical Appraisal Report. Highways England 2017.