

[REDACTED]

From: Simon Davis

Sent: 26 March 2020 15:32

[REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Y/17/20/PL - Land north of Yapton C of E Primary North End Road Yapton - Additional Repsonse

Dear Ian,

I hope you are well and staying sane at home.

I have received the following reply from the agent to your email of 17 March 2020 09:49.

Note that this condition was imposed on the outline Y/88/18/OUT: *No development shall commence until the vehicular access serving the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved "Proposed Access Arrangement" drawing 2014/2270/001 Rev C.*

That condition would not technically have allowed for any change via the s278 process but as I understand from Ellie White's email below, the S.278 on the Y/88/18/OUT permission has been agreed therefore there should be no reason to further amend the access. This would thus negate the need for a condition?

Re the visibility condition, you can't pin this on occupation. Are the vis splays shown on the drawings? I can't tell for sure. If they are, then the requirement to implement these would be covered by the standard plans condition. We could then seperately have a condition that simply stated: "The visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 76m to the north and 2.4m by 67 metres to the south shall be permanently maintained and kept free of all obstructions over a height of 0.6 metre above adjoining carriageway level"

If they are not shown on the drawing, we request that they are put on the drawing and then follow the same approach. Or we could have a condition worded to require that the vis splays be provided before first use of the access.

What do you think?

Simon

From: Ellie White [REDACTED]

Sent: 20 March 2020 17:45

To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Y/17/20/PL - Land north of Yapton C of E Primary North End Road Yapton - Additional Repsonse

Hi Simon,

I have now received further information from the applicant.

As I understand it, the footway and RSA is now longer an issue as neither are specifically required.

In terms of the S278, these has been signed off for the Outline so I am assuming that this is no longer an issue?

In terms of the condition, this has been secured through Condition 5 of the Outline consent? In addition, the planning statement clearly sets out the reason for submitting the application, this is to ensure that the access is not encumbered or restricted by other condition restrictions, ensuring delivery prior to commencing on the dwellings. We would not want the standalone access to be restricted in any way by a condition.

I hope this addresses Ian's queries and if not, do you have an opinion on the request for a condition?

With Kind Regards,
Ellie

From: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>

Sent: 17 March 2020 10:28

To: Ellie White [REDACTED]

Subject: FW: Y/17/20/PL - Land north of Yapton C of E Primary North End Road Yapton - Additional Repsonse

Hi Ellie,

Please see below response. Have you any thoughts on how the access is conditioned?

From: Ian Hayward [REDACTED]

Sent: 17 March 2020 09:49

To: Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
[REDACTED]

Subject: Y/17/20/PL - Land north of Yapton C of E Primary North End Road Yapton - Additional Repsonse

Morning Simon,

I know you have been in contact with my colleague Stephen Garrard about the above site.

I'm aware that our initial consultation response (21st February 2020) raised a request for a footway to link north out of the site to link into the Clays Farm Development Site.

The Local Highways Authority accepts that there is an existing fallback position for the access works as approved and therefore it would not be reasonable to insist on such a footway provision. We also accept that there is the opportunity to link the Clays Farm development site and this site internally. Such an internal connection can be considered under the subsequent Reserve Matters applications. The layouts of both sites is such that an internal layout would be as convenient for pedestrian and cyclists to use (particularly for south bound trips) as a footway link between the sites on North End Road. As such the footway request should be considered advice only and not insisted upon.

In addition we would like to clarify ordinarily the WSCC Road Safety Audit policy would require an RSA for this application. However given this access is the same as that approved under Y/88/18/OUT the Highway Authority does not consider it necessary to request revised RSA to assess the application.

Given the principle of the application (access only) I would appreciate some advice on how the access can, if possible, be conditioned. The submitted plan (YAP-S278-01 Red D) is subject to change while it goes through the S278 process. As such any access condition would need to be 'with plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the LPA'. Once the Section 278 Agreement had reached the Technical Approval stage it is these plans

that can be submitted to finally approve the access plans. I'm mindful that we would normally request the access is provided prior to occupation but given there is technically no dwellings secured by this application is that possible? If an access condition can be worded to take the above into account it would be appreciated. The following visibility condition and informative note would also be requested.

Visibility

No part of the development shall be first occupied until visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 76m to the north and 2.4m by 67 metres to the south have been provided at the proposed site vehicular access onto North End Road in accordance with the approved planning drawings. Once provided the splays shall thereafter be maintained and kept free of all obstructions over a height of 0.6 metre above adjoining carriageway level or as otherwise agreed.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

Informative Note

Works within the Highway – Implementation Team

The applicant is required to obtain all appropriate consents from West Sussex County Council, as Highway Authority, to cover the off-site highway works. The applicant is requested to contact The Implementation Team Leader [REDACTED] to commence this process. The applicant is advised that it is an offence to undertake any works within the highway prior to the agreement being in place.

Ian Hayward

Planning Services
