

Comment for planning application WSCC/052/20

Application number	<input type="text" value="WSCC/052/20"/>
Name	<input type="text" value="Gordon Bell"/>
Address	<input type="text" value="POACHERS, EASTERGATE LANE, EASTERGATE LANE, CHICHESTER, PO20 3SJ"/>
Type of Comment	<input type="text" value="Objection"/>

Comments

1) The proposal Displays Poor Road Design regarding the unsuitable style and landscape character of the proposed Rusty Metal Wall as a Roadside Environmental Mitigation and Enhancement Structure (Noise Barrier). Vast tracts of land have been acquired south of the B2233 to build houses BUT too little land has been acquired north of the B2233 to permit a satisfactory road construction. The proposal fails to meet the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, particularly documents LD 119 sections (2) & (5) and document GG103 section 4. The local existing residents object strongly to the Rusty Metal Wall proposed as a noise barrier. The acquisition of more land would permit a landscaped solution in this semi-rural location, as required by the DMRB documents LD119 and GG103. As an absolute minimum requirement, any barrier should be the same colour as the local landscape and should have planting on both sides to mitigate the consequences of graffiti on such an attractive target for "street artists". 2) There has been a complete Failure by the project team to Properly Engage with Residents. The level of actual meaningful engagement of the public by WSCC throughout this project has been lamentable from the beginning, with superficial, poorly presented and supported events and activities clearly designed to enable the project team to "tick boxes" on the project plan. This has failed to properly inform residents, listen to their concerns, answer their questions or take their comments into consideration in the design of the proposed solution - as required by the relevant Road Design Standards, including GG103 section 4. The project team has also failed to properly inform existing residents, whose properties will be within 20m of the new road, of the full range of compensatory provisions that may be available to them as a consequence of the disturbance and losses they will suffer during both construction and operation of the new road. 3) The proposal fails to meet the requirements of ADC Local Plan Policies H SP2. The proposal demonstrates poor compliance with the Local Plan policies and fails completely to determine the cumulative impact on the existing settlements of all the planned developments, both housing and infrastructure, regarding future traffic volumes and the impact on wildlife and fails to describe how these impacts will be mitigated. Meeting these policies is vital if the needs of the current and future population are to be respected. 4) The proposal fails to meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 110. The proposal does not adequately address the requirements in paragraphs (a), (b) & (c) to provide for and protect pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled from the risks from conflict with motorised traffic. The application contains no assessment of Non Motorised User demand at all the proposed crossing locations so it is IMPOSSIBLE to satisfactorily determine the appropriate crossing type. 5) Flooding and drainage. The whole local area has a high winter water table and has a history of extensive surface water flooding, which will only intensify with climate change. The two northern attenuation ponds are shown to discharge into a ditch that currently drains existing dwellings, flows into the Lidsey Rife, which has flooded Barnham village centre many times and is regarded as incapable of handling additional flows. Surface Water Management plans to minimise flooding have been created but not yet implemented and ground water every winter is consistently at ground level on the land adjoining this development and temporary pumping solutions are commonplace around the villages. There appears to be no evidence presented in the application that demonstrates that the road development is in compliance with the Arun District Council Supplementary Requirements for Surface Water Drainage Proposals. This application does not address these concerns adequately and does not demonstrate that surface water drainage design will be effective and meet all the management plan standards that have been put in place over 25 years to protect the current community. The project team have even secured, from ADC, permission to ignore the national standard of 1 metre of unsaturated ground beneath soakaways AND have been forced to refuse a written request, from ADC drainage engineers, to utilise infiltration as well as piped drainage from the attenuation ponds, because the ponds need to be lined due to the high winter water table. The drainage engineer request was made to minimise additional flow into the ditches and the rife and to minimise the risk of flooding in Barnham. 6) Under Estimated Traffic forecasts. The conclusions from the traffic impact analysis do not align with the expected traffic growth from the cumulative impact of SD5 and other planning-approved housing growth and the growing flows of traffic from Bognor Regis, Littlehampton and other growing localities. If the TRICS-based formulae used by WSCC Highways to predict future traffic flows from planning proposal BN/50/20 are applied to the expected housing growth in the areas utilising the A29 and B2233, the expected traffic flows along those roads will be 4 to 5 TIMES the level predicted in this planning application. A proper forecast of the cumulative effects on traffic growth, as a consequence of all the relevant Local Plans and their total future housing levels, must be presented in a transparent way alongside the proposed mitigation measures. This application demonstrates that this subject has not been addressed adequately or in line with other WSCC highways traffic projections. 7) To add insult to injury, the WSCC-commissioned "Fly-

through Fantasy" grossly exaggerated the level of tree and bush planting throughout the project, when compared to the landscape design drawings. Another WSCC confidence trick!! WSCC/052/20 is a cheap, shoddy, rushed application for an entirely similar road project which must be refused.

Received

14/12/2020 17:34:23

Attachments