



APPENDIX 1.1 - REG 25 TABLE

(New) Appendix documents the Regulation 25 requests, along with details of how they have been addressed and the Sections within the Revised ES or ES Addendum where the updates have been incorporated.

Ref	Item	Issue	Response	Where addressed
2	Plans	Insufficient sections have been provided. Additional/revised sections should be provided that:		New sections provided in Appendix 3.1b of the Revised ES
3	Plans	a. Extend sufficiently to demonstrate the relationship between the road and adjacent land uses. Where relevant, these should detail residential gardens properties and accurately show any existing/proposed boundary treatments.	A new drawing - Appendix 3.6, has been prepared to show the wider context. At the time of writing the location of the residential properties had not been fixed, as such the plan shows the latest available information on the proposed areas of development and green infrastructure associated with the BEW site. Further information on the proposed landscape design of the BEW development including integration with the A29 is found in the Barratt David Wilson Homes Integration Statement attached as Appendix 14.2 of the Revised ES.	Appendix 3.6 and 14.2 of the Revised ES.
4	Plans	b. Include indicative landscape proposals (Only hedgerow alongside acoustic barrier currently shown).	Further details of the proposed landscaping has been included on the revised GA drawings along with details of surfacing materials.	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES. Appendix 3.3 (landscape strategy) of the Revised ES. Appendix 2.3 of the ES Addendum.
5	Plans	c. Ensure that 'existing ground levels' on section E-E are correct (a landscaped bund alongside the Halo site does not appear to be shown). Nb: It should be confirmed that associated noise implications have been considered).	The 3D noise modelling is based on the Scheme Site Plan and has assumed removal of the bund. The cross section A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-C-0182 S0-P06 (Appendix 3.1 to the Revised ES) has been updated to show the existing and proposed ground levels.	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES.
6	Plans	d. Provide an east/west section at the proposed roundabouts at Fontwell Avenue and Barnham Road (to include lighting columns).	New drawings have been produced A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-C-0236 & 0237 Fontwell Avenue Rbt and Barnham Road Rbt respectively.	Appendix 3.1b
7	Plans	e. Provide outline sections of ponds to confirm their depth/ design for ecological benefit.	Pond 2 - A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-D-0240 S0 P01, Pond 3 - A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-D-0241 S0 P01, Pond 4 - A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-D-0242 S0 P01 are included in Appendix 3.1b. This includes water depth and further information on ecological benefits.	Appendix 3.1b
8	Plans	f. Provide sections (and profiles) to show proposed levels for the 'temporary access track' to the south of Barnham Road	A new drawing has been produced A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-C-0243 in Appendix 3.1b with track profile and typical cross section with detail of unbound surface construction.	Appendix 3.1b
9	Plans	• Layout and elevation details of the proposed substation is required (to include details of any proposed hard/soft landscaping and boundary treatments).	New cross section of the proposed substation in its revised location (relocated since submission of the ES in October 2020) has been provided and included in the ES Addendum Appendix 2.2. This cross section provides the details of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments.	Appendix 2.2. of the ES Addendum.
10	Plans	• Details of surfacing materials is required. This should provide details of all hard surfaces proposed, include those proposed at substation and pond access tracks. – Revised/additional plans with this detail required.	Further details of the surfacing materials have been included on the revised GA drawings A29-CAP-HGN-00-DR-C-0132 to 136 included in Appendix 3.1 of the Revised ES and Appendix 2.1 of the ES Addendum.	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES. And Appendix 2.1 of the ES Addendum.
11	Plans	• The submitted Landscape plan (Appendix 3.3 - Sheet 5) shows an emboldened ramp/road feature adjacent to the pond the purpose of which is unclear and not included on any other plans. Please clarify/amend.	This ramp has been removed. Revised landscape drawings have been included in Appendix 3.3 of the Revised ES and Appendix 2.3 of the ES Addendum.	Appendix 3.3 (landscape strategy) of the Revised ES and Appendix 2.3 of the ES Addendum.
12	Plans	• Design drawings (Appendix 3.1) do not appear to show any details of the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing features on the northern limb of the Fontwell Avenue roundabout, or connection with the service road area (inconsistency with landscape and lighting plans).	The lighting and landscape strategy has evolved since submission of the ES. The GA drawings have been updated with the latest lighting and landscape detail and design. A29-CAP-HGN-00-DR-C-0132 to 136 have been updated and included in Revised ES Appendix 3.1.	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES

13	Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the design drawings and landscape plans are unclear as to how the new service road at Fontwell Avenue would terminate/transition into the new road alignment. Any boundary treatment, hard landscaping features, and vehicle turning areas (if proposed) must be made clear. Please clarify/amend. 	<p>The GA drawings have been updated and additional annotation included in the vicinity of the new service road at Fontwell Avenue. Landscape features have been included on the GA drawings, including details of surface materials. A29-CAP-HGN-00-DR-C-0132 to 136 are included in Revised Appendix 3.1. Labels added to the drawing 0132 to explain how the northern end of the Fontwell Avenue of the service road is terminated. The vehicles using the animal feed centre undertake the existing movement to reverse into the access.</p>	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES
14	Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design drawing (Sheet 1), seems to show areas of footpath alongside the Fontwell Avenue roundabout (in blue), that seemingly are shared footpath/cycleway (based on markings/width)? Further, it is not clear from this plan how proposed new foot/cycleways would transition into the existing highway features. Please clarify/amend colour key. 	<p>The key has been amended and further annotation provided within A29-CAP-HGN-00-DR-C-0132 to 136 (Revised ES Appendix 3.1). Labels added to drawing 0132 to explain the limit of the shared footway/cycleway and proposed signs for cyclist to dismount at the end.</p>	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES
15	Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline details of all proposed fencing and gates is required. This should include a plan and associated schedule detailing all proposed perimeter fencing, badger fencing (as specified in the Ecological Management Plan), pond containment fencing, deer fencing (if required), PROW fencing/gates/barriers (refer to PROW comments also), substation fencing, boundary fencing at the Halo site, and any fencing likely to be required to contain new planting areas. Further the proposed materials/finish of the acoustic barrier should be specified. Revised/additional 3 plans with this detail required. Clarification should be provided as to how such fencing has been considered in the LVIA. 	<p>Fencing details have been included in the GA drawings included as Appendix 3.1 of the Revised ES and Appendix 2.1 of the ES Addendum.</p>	Appendix 3.1 of the Revised ES and Appendix 2.1 of the ES Addendum.
16	Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design drawing (Sheet 4), seems to show cycleway markings in the carriageway (as opposed to on the shared cycleway). Please clarify/amend. 	<p>The GA drawings have been updated . A29-CAP-HGN-00-DR-C-0132 to 136 are included in Revised Appendix 3.1. Road markings in the carriageway are to advise cyclist where they can leave the carriageway and join the shared footway/cycleway.</p>	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES
17	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify the total volume and likely specification of imported fill material that would be used to facilitate the raised highway (ref Table 3-3 which suggests a requirement for import of materials). 	<p>Imported fill volumes have been included in Chapter 3</p>	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES
18	General	<p>It is noted that three construction compounds are proposed throughout the period of construction, however, details of their exact locations, and what they are likely to contain is limited. Outline layout plans should be provided including details of any likely mitigation measures/orientations which have been assumed to calculate construction impacts, particularly given the proximity to nearby residents. Further, whilst it is noted that a Construction Phase Drainage plan is proposed at the detailed design/implementation stage, comfort is sought that consideration has been given to the location of compounds to avoid areas of surface water flooding and/or that significant raising of land levels to accommodate the compounds would not be required.</p>	<p>Information concerning outline compound layouts has been provided within additional suitable detail contained with the revised planning drawings A29-CAP-HGN-00-DR-C-0132 to 136 in Appendix 3.1 .</p> <p>Additional text has been provided within Chapter 3 concerning site compounds and surface water flooding. A separate plan of the Site Compounds has been included as Appendix 3.8.</p>	Appendix 3.1, Appendix 3.8 and Chapter 3 of the Revised ES.
19	General	<p>Environmental Statement para 5.4.15 suggests the development would take 3 years to implement, contrary to all other references in the documents which suggest a construction period of 1 year. Please clarify and confirm the basis for impact assessment.</p>	<p>Amended to 12 months.</p>	edits made to 5.4.15 within Chapter 5 of the Revised ES
20	General	<p>Please clarify how the unused limbs of the proposed roundabouts would be managed/closed until such time as future housing development comes forward.</p>	<p>Additional text has been provided within Chapter 3 providing further detail.</p>	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES

21	Highways	<p>Request look right surface markings. Timber staggered barrier with useable gap of at least 1.2m on the southern side of the new road south of where the footpath meets the proposed footway on the southern side of the new road to reduce the ability of people walking straight out onto the shared cycle/footway and onto the carriageway.</p> <p>It is suggested that temporary re-routing or diversion of the PROW would be required and that would be subject to further discussion with WSCC PROW. As a minimum, the likely diversion/closure options should be presented and their expected durations) so the potential impacts can be considered.</p>	<p>An application under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in relation to Stopping up or Diversion of a Public Footpath, Bridleway or Restricted Byway will be submitted at the same time as the planning application. In preparation of the s257 consultation has been undertaken with the affected landowner.</p>	
22	Highways	<p>Design of road - A Design Check for the proposal is required. This should set-out design standards used for each component of the scheme including any identified Departures from Standard.</p>	<p>A list of design standards and departures will be provided alongside the final detailed design submission. A draft schedule has been provided as a new Appendix 3.7 to the Revised ES.</p>	<p>Appendix 3.7 of the Revised ES</p>
23	Highways	<p>Cycling infrastructure - For all cycle facilities, the applicant should show how these have been considered alongside LTN 1/20.</p>	<p>A review was undertaken of the cycling infrastructure against LTN 1/20. Section 3.1.36 has been updated to include reference to LTN1/20. This has been confirmed in Chapter 3. Details of the review are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The A29 realignment scheme is considered an inter-urban route and will be designed for a 30mph speed limit. 2.The scheme will have <300users/per hour, even with full development (Phase 2) there will be low flow of pedestrian and cyclists. 3.The shared-use footway could be reasonably considered as a cycle track. At 2m width, most bikes can pass each other including tricycles and trailers which are 0.8m wide. It is probably also worth noting Highways England guidance (CD143 Para E/3.5) on this scheme as the junction is considered trunk road in nature. This states: Widths of unsegregated shared use routes shall be a minimum of: 1)3.0 metres where there are 200 users an hour or more; or 2)2.0 metres where there are less than 200 users per hour. 4.There is no horizontal separation proposed along the route due to space limitations and land available from the developer. 5.The shared-use provision and lack of separation around junctions where speeds are significantly lower than 30mph should not raise concerns. 6.Relevant sections from the LTN 1/20 guidance: •Section 5.5.3- Where a route is also used by pedestrians, separate facilities should be provided for pedestrian and cycle movements. However, away from the highway, and alongside busy interurban roads with few pedestrians or building frontages, shared use might be adequate. Such facilities should be designed to meet the needs of cycle traffic, however – including its width, alignment and treatment at side roads and other junctions •Table 5-2: Cycle lane and track widths two-way and less than 300 users per hour flow desirable 3m width. •Section 6.5.6 Shared use may be appropriate in some situations, if well-designed and implemented. Some are listed below: alongside interurban and arterial roads where there are few pedestrians; •Table 6-3: Recommended minimum widths for shared use routes carrying up to 300 pedestrians per hour Cycle flows Minimum width Up to 300 cyclists per hour 3.0m 7.Where there is derogation from recommendations, the guidance recommends engagement with local interested parties. This has taken place during the design stage. 8.The scheme has designed for a shared 3m pedestrian/cycle way this is the recommended minimum from the guidance. 	<p>Chapter 3 of the Revised ES</p>
24	Highways	<p>Street lighting – From consideration of the plans, a street lighting scheme is shown for the entire road. However, with regard to the lighting for the cycle path, it is not clear whether the lighting here is suitable solely for the path or whether it is suitable for the road as well (or combination of both).</p>	<p>Lighting suitable for the road is included at the junction and approaches only. Lighting along the length of the route relates to the footpath/cycleway. Further details have been provided in Chapter 3 and within the Lighting Assessment (Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES)</p>	<p>Chapter 3 and Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES</p>

		<p>Access to properties/businesses at western-end of road – Reference is made to swept path diagrams demonstrating access to properties and businesses at the western-end of the new road. However, these cannot be located in the TA. Please provide these for all vehicles likely to use the proposed re-configured access arrangements. Diagrams should extend to access to buildings in the south-eastern side of the roundabout too.</p>	<p>Swept path drawings have been included in Appendix 3.1c of the Revised ES.</p>	<p>Appendix 3.1c of the Revised ES</p>
26	Highways	<p>Access to Halo industrial site – One of the submitted drawings shows access to the Halo commercial buildings taken from the southern-end of the new road. If access to Halo is proposed to change, this will need to be considered as part of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit. Furthermore, visibility splays and details of this access should also be submitted (i.e. geometry, visibility splays etc.). The above-mentioned Design Check should also include consideration of this.</p>	<p>Jackson Civil Engineering (Design and construction contractor) working with Capita had previously considered this and their opinion was/is that they don't believe this design change needs to be considered as part of the RSA1 as stated. The RSA1 is carried out at completion of preliminary design stage. This Halo entrance option was not being considered at preliminary design stage, and only came about several months later as a result of WSCC dialogue with the Halo site owner. Jackson have previously therefore suggested to WSCC that we specifically raise this in the RSA 2 brief as an item that has changed since the RSA 1 and needs to be reviewed appropriately during the RSA 2. The WSCC Lead Safety Auditor has responded to us agreeing with this approach.</p>	
27	Highways	<p>Construction compounds south of Barnham Road – These will necessitate movement of plant and materials across Barnham Road. Please provide further detail of method of operation during the construction phase. Also, are any compounds proposed north of Barnham Road?</p>	<p>Further details of the construction compound locations and operations have been included in Chapter 3. Details of construction vehicle movements and Site compounds are also included in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Appendix 3.5 of the Revised ES).</p>	<p>Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.5 of the Revised ES</p>
28	Highways	<p>Speed limit – Please provide information to demonstrate how the road would be suitable for the proposed 30mph speed limit. Explain how the road has been designed for 30mph</p>	<p>Details of the speed limit and speed calming measures have been included in Chapter 3.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 of the Revised ES</p>
29	Highways	<p>With reference to the comments of Arun District Council, WSCC Highways, Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council, and third parties, clarification is sought in respect of the figures used for traffic forecasts, and demonstration that these have robustly taken into account future planned demand resulting from both approved and future development of neighbouring allocated Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate site (SD5).</p>	<p>The total BEW housing trajectory is (4180 dwellings). In addition to the inclusion of committed developments within the modelled area, growth factors have been used to calculate the background growth within the modelled area. Local TEMPro factors have been used for all car user classes growth rates, which take into account local demographic change, socio-economic variation and changes in modes as well as other factors that affect the growth of traffic within the locality. Origin and destination growth rates have been calculated using the TEMPro software (v7.2) for the AM, Inter-peak and PM periods for the relevant authorities within the study area and from regions within the external area for each modelled time period and journey purpose.</p>	<p>Section 5.2 updated in Appendix 8.1 - Transport Assessment (TA) to include additional detail regarding how future development has been included in the forecast modelling including BEW allocation. Additional section 5.7 included in TA to assess the level of performance for the proposed junctions at A29 Fontwell Avenue / Northern section of Re-alignment road and B2233 Barnham Road / Northern section of Re-alignment when using traffic flows including A29 Re-alignment Phase 2</p>

30	Highways	Further clarification is sought regarding the consideration given to the potential effect of increases in traffic on the stretch of Fontwell Avenue from the new roundabout to the A27 and any potential for increased congestion.	(As above) Traffic flows have been provided for Fontwell Avenue in figures 5.2 & 5.3 in the TA.	Additional text included in Appendix 8.1 - TA section 5.8 regarding traffic flow changes, between the DM and DS scenario, for the local area including on the A29
31	Highways	Outline details of construction routing should be provided within the CEMP.	Details of the construction routing and proposed Construction Worker Travel Plan have been included in Section 2 of the OCEMP (Appendix 3.5 of the Revised ES).	Appendix 3.5 of the Revised ES.
32	Highways	Clarify how/why uncontrolled crossings have been specified and the extent to which this has taken into account existing/proposed users and footfall.	Details have been included in Chapter 3 to outline how the crossings have been assessed.	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES
33	Highways	Clarify if all the safety audit recommendations been incorporated into the Scheme	Details have been added to Chapter 3 to detail how RSA1 changes have been included.	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES
34	Ecology	Conclusions of the ES assume that the lighting can and would be dimmed and/or turned off for several lighting units during sensitive periods of Bat activity (in particular those proximate to the PROW crossing point). However, it remains unclear how/if this could be controlled, the duration of such periods, and whether reduced lighting would be sufficient to ensure highway safety. Please clarify and/or consider an outline lighting management scheme.	Details in relation to the lighting management during sensitive periods along the route and in the vicinity of the PROW in particular is detailed in an Outline Lighting Management Scheme, attached to the Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix 10.2- of the Revised ES).	Appendix 10.2 Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix B - Outline Lighting Management Scheme)
35	Ecology	Please clarify if sections are missing between 9.6.4 and 9.6.20 of the Environmental Statement? (For example, Table 9-21 refers to 9.6.15 in respect of landscape design response to hedgerow severance)?	No missing paragraphs, paragraph numberings amended and updated paragraph references provided in Table 9-21.	

36	Ecology	The consideration given to the potential for cumulative or in-combination effects on Ecology and Nature Conservation resulting from the future development of site allocation (SD5 - Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate) is unclear. Given the proximity to allocated future development land (in particular the Barratts David Wilson Homes development), and the potential for impacts upon ecological receptors/habitats which currently span both sites, further analysis of the potential for cumulative effects is sought. This should include discussion of potential severance impacts and consider any preliminary ecological assessments undertaken for neighbouring land (e.g. as part of allocation and/or development proposals).	In addition to Chapter 14 - Cumulative Effects, a cumulative effects section has been included in Chapter 9. Details of how measures to mitigate ecological effects and maintain connectivity with the neighbouring proposed development have been detailed in Appendix 14.2 - Integration Statement.	Section 9.8 of the Revised ES and Appendix 14.2 Integration Statement
37	Ecology	There is a need to demonstrate the extent to which the proposed scheme has considered or may limit opportunities for integration into neighbouring future development sites. Where appropriate opportunities to mitigate any such impacts should be explored/identified.	A Cumulative effects section has been added to Chapter 9, focusing on the Barratts Development. Appendix 14.2 - Integration Statement has been included, describing the proposed integration in relation to ecology and landscape in particular, with the adjacent proposed development. .	Section 9.8 and Appendix 14.2 of the Revised ES - Integration Statement
38	PROW	Summary/clarification/further information on the following: - Potential/need for the use of "look right" surface markings at pedestrian crossing points. - Potential/need for the use of timber staggered barriers and fencing in paths at the proposed PROW crossing point. It is suggested that temporary re-routing or diversion of the PROW would be required and that would be subject to further discussion with WSCC PROW. As a minimum, the likely diversion/closure options should be presented (and their expected duration) so that potential impacts can be considered.	Details added to Chapter 3, road markings and staggered barriers are shown in Appendix 3.1	Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.1 of the Revised ES
39	Trees	Clarify if any future review of the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) could impact upon retained trees	Further consultation has been undertaken with the project arboriculturist in relation to red line boundary revisions and advice provided in relation to foreseeable impacts during construction. We recommend that the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are reviewed during detailed design and are updated to address any necessary amendments to the proposed tree protection measures or likely impacts. We further recommend that a planning condition be employed to ensure that any amendments to the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are secured to the satisfaction of the Council.	
40	Trees	Clarify the provision of any Arboricultural monitoring and site supervision throughout construction and proposals for a pre-commencement meeting.	Details in relation to the monitoring programme will be incorporated in the detailed CEMP to be prepared by the construction contractor prior to commencement. The clearance plans (Appendix 3.1a) include the requirement for development of Arboricultural Method Statements in areas identified as restricted working zones. The CEMP will be submitted to WSCC for review and comment. This should form a planning condition.	Appendix 3.1a (Clearance Plans) and Appendix 3.5 (OCEMP) of the Revised ES
41	Trees	Landscape Plans - Clarify what is meant by 'Areas to retain maximum feasible amount of vegetation'. How would this be determined and by who?	Further development of the construction working practices has occurred, and construction exclusion zone areas have been identified. As such the previous 'areas to retain maximum feasible amount of vegetation' has been updated to include two separate distinctions: 1."Restricted Working Zone" – whereby existing vegetation is only stripped where absolutely necessary and works methodology is to be agreed with the ECoW. Works within these areas to be subject to a task/location specific Arboricultural Method Statement. The AMS for each to be developed during construction planning/detailed design. This should form a planning condition and text has been included in the Planning Statement to address this. 2."Construction Exclusion Zone" – whereby vegetation strip is avoided all together and construction works access is excluded. These zones are also shown within the Clearance Plans (Appendix 3.1a).	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) , 3.1a (Clearance Plans) and 3.3 (Landscape Strategy) of the Revised ES.

42	Trees	<p>A full detailed Planting schedule / Landscape strategy is sought to include and specify the following: Extracts of typical planting layout matrices. - Confirmation that all plant material and seed must be UK sourced and grown and comply with all current biosecurity regulations. - With the exception of the specimen trees, all planting stock should be transplants; - There is no oak (Quercus Robur) included in the planting mixes – it should be a component of SW1. Replace silver birch or elder with oak or reduce percentages of other species. - Specimen trees – omit copper beech, horse chestnut and cherry plum; use oak, field maple and alder (Alnus Glutinosa) instead. There could be problems with aspen suckering so use white willow (Salix alba) instead - There are 10 species listed and there are to be 16 trees – in what proportion? - Apple trees – there are numerous commercially available Sussex varieties. At least use Cox's Orange Pippin instead of Golden Delicious. My understanding was that some orchard planting was proposed (at least 6 trees) to compensate for the loss of the traditional orchard, so it should use traditional varieties on a semi-vigorous or vigorous rootstock. (See also the comments of the WSCC Landscape consultant regarding the form of the Orchard enclosure). - Hedge mix – ensure field maple is specified for the avoidance of doubt. The planting rate should be a minimum of 3 plants per linear metre</p>	<p>Planting schedule has been updated and included in Appendix 10.3 of the Revised ES. - Quercus rober has been included in SW1 - Copper beech, horse chestnut and cherry plum omitted, oak, field maple and alder included instead. The updated planting schedule has been reviewed and commented on by WSCC County Arboriculturist and WSCC County Ecologist.</p>	Appendix 10.3 of the Revised ES
43	Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address typographical errors and ensure all references to plans and British Standards are correctly labelled/referenced in the LMMP. 	<p>The LMMP has been updated to incorporate changes to the Landscape Strategy (Appendix 3.3) and Planting Schedule (Appendix 10.3).</p>	Appendix 10.4 (LMMP) of the Revised ES
44	Landscape	<p>Clarify proposed swale planting (also referred to as 'planters'). There is no description of what is proposed in the planting schedule. Please clarify/amend and ensure consistent across all plans.</p>	<p>Swale planting has been discussed with WSCC County Arboriculturist and County Ecologist. The updated swale planting includes Scarlet Willow, Meadowsweet and Purple loosestrife.</p>	Appendix 10.3 (Planting Schedule) of the Revised ES
45	Trees	<p>Landscape drawings seem to show a new hard-surfaced path through a retained TPO tree (T30) – Please clarify?</p>	<p>The key on the site plan (Appendix 3.1) indicates an unbound self binding gravel for the PRoW.</p>	Appendix 3.1 (Site Plan) of the Revised ES.
46	Trees	<p>Confirm or otherwise if detailed bespoke method statements are proposed for working and construction near trees.</p>	<p>foreseeable impacts during construction. We recommend that the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are reviewed during detailed design and are updated to address any necessary amendments to the proposed tree protection measures or likely impacts. Appendix 3.5 (OCEMP) and Appendix 3.1a (Site Clearance Plan) include requirement to identify and agree arboricultural protection methodologies (to include task/location specific Arboricultural Method Statement) with the construction planning team prior to construction. We further recommend that a planning condition be employed to ensure that any amendments to the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan are secured to</p>	Appendix 3.1a (Clearance Plans) and Appendix 3.5 (OCEMP) of the Revised ES

47	Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitted LVIA requires more consideration of the potential effects on landscape character. The visual baseline requires some clarification and diagrams should be checked. • More consideration needs to be given to the effects of the proposed lighting scheme. • Where potentially significant effects have been established, there should be further discussion of potential mitigation measures. • The landscape plans require more detail and to be shown in the context of the wider landscape and future development land to demonstrate green infrastructure linkages • The status/relevance of the Green Infrastructure Strategy needs to be confirmed and if necessary be reflected in the submitted plans. 	<p>Further detail has been included within the the LVIA Section 10.4 - Baseline Conditions and within 10.7 Sensitive Receptors. Further description provided in relation to assessment of effects at the national, county and district levels. A separate section for Lighting Effects has been included in the Chapter.</p> <p>Appendix 3.6 (Wider Landscape Plan) provides a drawing showing the wider landscape context with the latest available information from the BEW development (November 2020) which links the A29 GI strategy with corridors identified in adjacent developments.</p> <p>The landscape strategy (Appendix 3.3) has been revised and additional hedgerow incorporated.</p>	<p>Section 10.4, Section 10.5, Section 10.9 of the Revised ES.</p> <p>Figure 10.1, Appendix 3.3 (Landscape Strategy) and 3.6 (Wider Landscape Plan) of the Revised ES.</p>
48	Landscape	<p>Clarify what land identified as 'temporary land use' would be used for. Also clarify how/if this land and contractor compounds would be reinstated and the programme/measures to achieve this.</p>	<p>Temporary land use is that required for construction, including working areas and construction compounds. These areas will be returned to their former state following completion of works in that area. Where the land is going to be passed directly to the adjacent developers for immediate use, the land will be left in a tidy state and not reinstated to former use (refer to Appendix 3.8 - Compound Sites). Further details are provided in Chapter 3.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.8 (Compound Sites) of the Revised ES</p>
49	Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further clarification is sought as to how the proposed landscaping/planting proposals relate to the future development of site allocation (SD5 - Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate), consideration given to opportunities for integration thereto, and the extent to which the proposed scheme may impact upon future visual receptors. 	<p>The GI strategy was discussed with Barratts and further liaison was carried out through development of the preliminary design. Details of the proposed Integration with the Barratts Development are described in Appendix 14.2.</p>	<p>Appendix 14.2. (Integration Statement) of the Revised ES</p>

50	Landscape	Landscape plans appear to show a 'woodland core' in the key, however, such features do not appear on the plans. Please clarify and confirm that up-to date landscape proposals have been used for the purposes of other assessments (e.g. landscape/ecological impacts and biodiversity calculations).	Woodland core was not included as proposed landscaping within the ES (9.6.2), and was left on the key in error. The Landscape Strategy has evolved to incorporate an additional 52m of hedgerow to achieve 10% BNG for the Scheme. The updated landscape strategy is included in Appendix 3.3.	Appendix 3.3 (landscape strategy) of the Revised ES and Appendix 2.3 of the ES Addendum.
51	Landscape	Landscape plans do not detail the proposed benches or other street furniture as shown on design plans (what is proposed in terms of bus stops?). Please clarify/amend.	Street furniture is not included as such is not shown in the Site Plan (Appendix 3.1) or Landscape Strategy (Appendix 3.3). Further details of the bus stop locations has been included in Chapter 3.	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES.
52	Landscape	• Details of all proposed fencing and gates is required, and clarification should be provided as to how/if fencing has been considered in the LVIA.	The revised Site Plan (Appendix 3.1) incorporate details of the proposed fencing. Further detail of the fencing and associated visual impacts have been included through Chapter 10 (LVIA).	Chapter 10 of the Revised ES
53	Drainage	• Calculations for storage volumes have been based upon default values for the coefficient for volumetric run off (Cv) contrary to the West Sussex LLFA Policy for the Management of Surface Water. Detailed design should use a Cv of 1.0 for the impermeable area only. Additionally, an FSR rainfall model has been used in calculations rather than FEH.	Details added to Chapter 3 to outline the design parameters used in the model design of the drainage and ponds.	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES
54	Drainage	• The LLFA is unclear why for Attenuation Basin 4, no betterment is proposed and reference has been made to WSCC Highway Drain Criteria and Document W5-074-A-TR-1 'Preliminary rainfall runoff management for developments'. A review of discharge at this location should be undertaken.	Further details have been added to Chapter 3	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES
55	Drainage	• It is not clear from the current proposals where run off from the isolated 7.8ha is now draining to? Reference E includes the statement: The proposed road alignment should therefore incorporate culverts with sufficient capacity to accommodate flows from the existing greenfield run-off. It is recommended that confirmation is sought that this run off has been taken into consideration in the downstream storm flow calculations.	Further details have been included in Chapter 3	Chapter 3 of the Revised ES

56	Drainage	It is highly recommended that due consideration of the proposed Phase 2 development is allowed for in any SuDS features. Also, significant cost and time saving could be achieved by working with the developers by integrating the drainage schemes.	Liaison has occurred with the Southern Consortium responsible for delivering the A29 (Phase 2) and development south of Barnham Road, and Barratts (north of Barnham Road) throughout the design process. This has included specific meetings with drainage teams to discuss interaction of drainage across the schemes. Since submission of the Planning Application and ES in October 2020 further discussions with the Southern Consortium have occurred as their masterplan has progressed. This has resulted in the rotation of Pond 4 as described in Chapter 1 and detailed in Chapter 3 to better fit with their emerging designs. As such the drainage for Phase 1 has been updated to accommodate the latest Southern Consortium designs. Any further changes which arise as Southern Consortium design progresses will need to be considered separately through the developer's own application.	
57	Drainage	Please clarify the likely depth of water in proposed ponds and how/if this would be affected by seasonality.	Additional drawings showing the details including cross sections of Ponds 2,3,4 have been prepared. This shows the maximum and minimum water depths within the ponds.	Appendix 3.1b (New Section Drawings)
58	Drainage	Design drawings (Appendix 3.1) appear to suggest that the layout and size of attenuation ponds has yet to be determined and would be dependant of future investigation/infiltration testing. This is echoed in the findings of the Environmental Statement which suggest that proposed drainage design would be dependant on further groundwater monitoring and CCTV surveys etc.	Further details have been included in Chapter 3 and in the Flood Risk Assessment following CCTV surveys and review of additional infiltration testing conducted in Winter 20/21.	Additional GW monitoring summarised in Table 11.12 in Revised ES. Also updated in FRA (Appendix 11.1)
59	Drainage	Noting the above, and the comments of the EA (who suggest both conditions restricting use of infiltration and that deep infiltration drainage methods would be unlikely to be supported), there is a need to demonstrate that the outline proposed drainage strategy would be deliverable/operable to the required EA/LLFA standards (supported by further investigation where necessary) and that the physical features of the outline drainage proposals would not be likely to change to any significant extent. In essence, there is a need to provide greater certainty on the likely design of the drainage scheme to ensure that the proposed physical features are representative and thus to confirm the associated impacts considered by other ES disciplines (e.g. Landscape/ecology) are reliably based.	The pond 4 has been rotated and moved as a response to feedback from the Southern Consortium. The pond has been designed in line with the parameters as per item 53 and the infiltration rates set out in the A29-CAP-HDG-00-AN-D-0052 TN - Drainage Strategy S3-P05 and A29-CAP-HDG-00-AN-D-0058 TN - S3-P04. Meetings are being held with Arun District Council during the detailed design phase regarding the detailed specifications for the infiltration crates at Fontwell Avenue Rbt	Appendix E2 to the Flood Risk Assessment (Appendix 11.1 of the Revised ES).
60	Drainage	With reference to the LLFA comments, further clarification is sought to demonstrate that due consideration has been given to any potential impacts on the future development of site allocation (SD5 - Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate). In particular there is a need to demonstrate the extent to which the proposed drainage strategy may sterilise or impact upon future development land as a result of any increased flood risk/drainage matters (e.g. altering catchments), and that extent to which the proposed scheme has considered or may limit opportunities for integration into both phase 2 and neighbouring future development sites (please also see the comments of 'The Southern Consortium' dated 15th December 2021).	Since submission of the Planning Application and ES in October 2020 further discussions with the Southern Consortium have occurred as their masterplan has progressed. This has resulted in the rotation of Pond 4 as described in Chapter 1 and detailed in Chapter 3 to better fit with their emerging designs. As such the drainage for Phase 1 has been updated to accommodate the latest Southern Consortium designs to avoid the potential to sterilise this area or impact on future development. The methodology for assessment of cumulative effects in relation to water and drainage have been described in Chapter 11. Any further changes which arise as Southern Consortium design progresses will need to be considered separately through the developer's own application	Chapter 3 and Chapter 11 of the Revised ES
61	AO	An emissions mitigation statement that includes proposed mitigation measures which should equal the health damage cost, with mitigation options designed into the development in accordance with the Standard Mitigations and Table 2 of Air Quality & Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex (Sussex Air Quality Partnership (2020) available at https://sussex-air.net/ImprovingAQ/GuidancePlanning.aspx);	The guidance relates to development and associated vehicle trip generation. This is not applicable to transport infrastructure schemes as the scheme itself does not generate any vehicle trips.	
62	AO	Table 6-13 and Figure 6-2 of the report incorrectly shows that ADC have an NO2 diffusion tube (Bog 13) sited at Beechfield Park. This is incorrect, Bog13 is located on Rowan way at approximate grid reference 493409 101228. This may have an effect on the result of the assessment. Figure 6-2 also appears to show an NO2 diffusion tube at the Nags Head which is also incorrect.	The tubes 'Bog13' and 'Nag's Head' as shown in Figure 6-2 were located according to the grid references given in the published Arun DC and Chichester DC LAQM Annual Status Reports for 2020. The given grid coordinates for Bog13 are 493417,104374 which locates the diffusion tube off Beechfield Park (the road name is not given in Adur's report). As neither of these tubes are used in model verification the modelled concentrations and assessment findings are unaffected by any locational error.	
63	AO	Land immediately to the south of the proposed scheme has been allocated for future residential development, however, the air quality assessment has not identified this area as a potential receptor (Figure 6-4) and as such no such modelling of pollutant levels has taken place for these planned new homes. It is important these are considered as part of the assessment and if required mitigation at an early stage identified.	At the time of the air quality assessment, no plan information showing the locations for individual new residential dwellings was available. Given the low annual mean NO ₂ concentrations determined for existing receptors adjacent to the Phase 1 realignment (the highest predicted concentration is 15.5µg/m3 at receptor E11 on Barnham Road with both Phase 1 and Phase 2 in place), the concentrations at potential new receptors adjacent to the Phase 2 alignment are unlikely to be substantially different. Further detail has been included in Chapter 6 and a section included to clarify study area and methodology for consideration of cumulative effects in relation to air quality.	Chapter 6 of the Revised ES

64	AQ	<p>As highlighted by the EHO and set out in the Scoping Opinion of this authority 'The impact on the air quality of future residents of housing allocated to the south of the road must be assessed'. Any assessment will need to consider whether the proposed development may sterilise or impact upon future development land as a result of any increased emissions, and the extent to which the proposed scheme has considered (including any mitigation relied upon) or may limit opportunities for integration into neighbouring future development sites.</p>	See response above.	Chapter 6 of the Revised ES
65	Noise	Raw data relied upon for noise assessment to be provided.	Modelled noise levels are presented in the report as noise level changes at each noise sensitive receptor within the study area. These are reported via noise contour maps in line with DMRB guidance (Figure 7.2 – Figure 7.4) and DMRB Tables within Appendix 7.3.	Figure 7.2 – Figure 7.4, Appendix 7.3 (Operational Noise) of the Revised ES
66	Noise	A number of properties with the potential to qualify under the Noise Insulation Regs are noted. These and possible mitigation measures (and what this may achieve) need to be clearly identified.	In line with the requirements of the NIR, the 'appropriate highway authority', is required to identify all eligible buildings within 6 months of the opening of the Scheme to traffic ('the relevant date'). As eligibility is based on the 'as-built' scheme, at this stage it is not possible to produce a definitive list of eligible properties and therefore, in line with DMRB, a forecast on the number of properties which are potentially eligible is provided. As stated in para 7.6.14, bullet no.8, 10 dwellings have been identified as having the potential to qualify under the Noise Insulation Regulations 1975 (as amended 1988). These are located on Barnham Road and the existing A29/Fontwell Avenue. The potentially eligible properties are shown on the updated Figure 7-6.	Figure 7.6 Appendix 7.3 (Operational Noise) of the Revised ES
67	Noise	Section 7.6.14 sets out the number of properties which would be affected by noise of various levels in the short term and long-term scenarios. It also states that in the short-term scenario, night time noise levels inside homes would be within the guidelines set out in BS8233. There is no similar reference to night time levels in the long-term scenario despite the number of dwellings affected by an increase in noise greater than 5dB being larger in the future years scenario as shown in tables A7.4.1 and A7.4.2. This should be addressed.	<p>The magnitude of change against which long term impacts are assessed is greater than in the short term (see Table 7-11).</p> <p>In the short-term, two dwellings are predicted to experience a major increase (defined as +5dB) during the night-time and therefore a comparison against BS 8223 criteria has been undertaken.</p> <p>In the long term, no receptors are predicted to experience a major increase in noise levels (defined as +10dB). During the night-time, a moderate increase in noise level (3-5 dB) is shown at 38, 36 of which are between the LOAEL and SOAEL. The remaining 2 are below the LOAEL (see para 7.6.14, bullet no.5).</p> <p>No dwellings are predicted to experience a significant change in noise level and be exposed to noise levels above the relevant SOAEL in any scenario</p>	Table 7-11 in Chapter 7 of the Revised ES
68	Noise	There is no mention as to whether noise levels during the day would achieve the levels set out in BS8233 either inside the dwelling or in the outside amenity space at these dwellings. Modelled noise levels for both scenarios should meet the levels set out in BS8233 for both day and night times at all properties. If this is not achievable further mitigation should be considered.	<p>Our methodology for the assessment and criteria to be used was discussed with Chris Davis at ADC. The use of the criteria set out within DMRB was identified as the basis for setting LOAELs and SOAELs. Achieving the levels set out in BS 8233 for the scheme was not raised during these discussions.</p> <p>It is noted that, as shown Section 7.4 of the report, existing baseline noise levels within the study area already exceed the levels set out in BS 8233 Therefore it is not appropriate to use the guideline values within BS 8233 for determining the level of mitigation required.</p> <p>The significance criteria used to identify potentially significant noise impacts from the operation of the Scheme follows DMRB guidance. DMRB sets out the magnitude of change thresholds and absolute external noise levels (LOAEL and SOAEL) for determining initial significance.</p> <p>Noise mitigation has been included within the iterative design process to inform the final design. This consists of a 3m high noise barrier, 435m in length to minimise noise at the closest properties to the Scheme. The noise mitigation achieves the design criteria for the Scheme with no dwellings predicted to experience a significant change in noise level (moderate or major as defined by DMRB) and be exposed to noise levels above the relevant SOAEL in any scenario. The dimensions of the barrier have been maximised to reduce as far as is practicable, within safety considerations and engineering constraints, noise levels from the Scheme at those properties most adversely affected.</p>	Section 7.4, Chapter 7 of the Revised ES

69	Noise	<p>• There does not appear to be any mitigation planned for these properties that are most adversely affected, especially in the long term. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The noise mitigation achieves the design criteria for the Scheme with no dwellings predicted to experience a significant change in noise level (moderate or major as defined by DMRB) and be exposed to noise levels above the relevant SOAEL in any scenario. Due to the speed limit of the Scheme (30 mph), the use of a thin surfacing or 'low noise' material would provide a negligible reduction in road traffic noise levels and is therefore not proposed as part of the Scheme.</p> <p>It is also noted that, overall the number of dwellings within the study area which are exposed to noise levels above the SOAEL during both the day and night time periods is reduced with the Scheme when compared to with-out the Scheme in place.</p> <p>In line with DMRB LA111, the final significance has been determined based on guidance including the absolute noise level in relation to the LOAEL and SOAEL, acoustic context and different magnitude of impact in the long term compared to the short term.</p>	Chapter 7 of the Revised ES
70	Noise	<p>As highlighted by the EHO and set out in the Scoping Opinion of this authority 'The noise/vibration impact on future occupants of housing to be located south of the proposed road, and beyond Barnham Road to the south must be taken into account in the assessment'. Accordingly, there is a need to demonstrate that due consideration has been given to any potential noise impacts on the future development of site allocation (SD5 - Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate) as a sensitive receptor. Given the proximity and noting the noise contours highlighted by figures 7-2 and 7-3, focus should be given to the Barratts David Wilson Homes development.</p>	<p>As set out in Section 7.3 of Chapter 7 of the ES, the Do-something Future Year (DSFY) has been modelled using traffic flows which assume Phase 2 of the A29 Realignment has been constructed (in addition to other schemes as set out in Chapter 14: Cumulative Effects). Phase 2 of the A29 Realignment is located to the south of the Scheme from the junction with Barnham Road to re-join the existing A29 south of Westergate. Whilst noise generated by traffic on any new road which forms Phase 2 will be assessed as part of any future planning application, the changes in traffic flow on Phase 1 (i.e. the Scheme) and associated noise has been included in this assessment. This represents a worst-case scenario in terms of increased traffic flow and noise increase at properties within the study area for the Scheme.</p> <p>In relation to the Barretts David Wilson Homes development, Section 5 of Chapter 7 of the ES, highlights that as part of the iterative design process for the Scheme, discussions have been held with the developer and the proposed outline site layout has been reviewed. As part of the iterative design process for the noise mitigation feature which forms part of the Scheme design, the use of an absorptive material is proposed for the north section (approximately 280 m) which faces the site of the potential new residential development. This is to reduce the potential for the reflection of noise from the noise mitigation barrier positioned on the eastern side of the Scheme to any new dwellings on the western side of the Scheme. It is noted that, the Scoping Opinion issued by Aru District Council for this site in April 2020 (planning ref BN/122/19/EIS) requires any planning application for the site to be supported by a noise and vibration report which considers 'the proposed A29 with regard to traffic flow, noise and vibration' (i.e. the Scheme). As the Scheme would be constructed before, or in parallel with, any new development, it is not appropriate to determine a 'before' Scheme noise level and therefore to assess the change in noise level at these locations as required in the DMRB guidance.</p>	Section 7.3 of Chapter 7 of the Revised ES
71	Noise	<p>Any assessment will need to consider whether the proposed development may sterilise or impact upon future development land as a result of any increased noise, and the extent to which the proposed scheme has considered (including any mitigation relied upon) or may limit opportunities for integration into neighbouring future development sites (noting the extent to which noise attestation may be most effective at source).</p>	<p>See response above. In addition to Chapter 14 - Cumulative Effects, a cumulative section has been included in Chapter 7.</p>	Section 7.3 and 7.8 of Chapter 7 of the Revised ES.
72	Noise	<p>• Clarify whether the noise assessment has considered the removal of the bund alongside the Halo site.</p>	<p>The 3D noise modelling is based on the Scheme Site Plan and has assumed removal of the bund.</p>	Revised cross section A29-CAP-HPN-00-DR-C-0182 S0-P06 (Appendix 3.1 to the Revised ES) shows the existing bund and proposed ground level following construction.

73	Geology and soils	<p>Sections 12.1.2 and 12.3.6 state that the geotechnical ground investigation, including contamination testing, would be undertaken and following this, a more detailed assessment of risk undertaken. Section 12.9.4, however, states that the risk to construction working has been categorised as 'low' and section 12.9.5 goes on to state that 'standard mitigation' will be required as part of the CEMP. How/would the risk assessment be updated following the intrusive investigation and remediation measures outlined as required.</p>	<p>Section 12.9.5 updated to include: "The proposed geotechnical investigations will include contamination testing. The findings of this will feed into any subsequent remediation strategy ahead of construction works.."</p>	<p>Chapter 12 of the Revised ES</p>
74	Geology and soils	<p>• The rationale for including the human health risk assessment in the CEMP needs to be explained. The risk assessment doesn't really sit within a CEMP as the contamination element is predominantly a risk assessment and not a management document and whilst there are overlaps, they are formed under separate legislation and codes of practice, etc. Please clarify.</p>	<p>OCEMP has been amended. Reference to further risk assessment has been removed. The order of mitigation has been made clearer: pre-construction and construction.</p>	<p>Appendix 3.5 (OCEMP) of the Revised ES</p>
75	Geology and soils	<p>The authors and associated signatures (on the quality control page) are mismatched. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The reviewer left the business, the signature says 'pp emp left business'.</p>	
76	Lighting	<p>The submitted lighting assessment states 'designs have been based on the 2013 version of BS5489 and should be reviewed against the 2020 amendments'. There is a need to demonstrate that the outline lighting scheme is likely to be deliverable/operable to the required standards and that lighting features would not be likely to change to any significant extent and thus to ensure associated impacts considered by other ES disciplines (e.g. Landscape/ecology) are reliably based.</p>	<p>WSP & SSE have reviewed traffic flows and amendments to standard and conclude that "While there is a 2020 revision to BS5489, there are no anticipated changes needed to align the lighting design with this revised standard and therefore the lighting levels and anticipated impacts detailed will not significantly change should further lighting design development be needed."</p>	<p>P24 of the Revised Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES)</p>
77	Lighting	<p>The submitted lighting assessment states it is 'recommended that lighting levels are reviewed at the detailed design stage with a view to reducing these levels where appropriate to do so based on: detailed traffic flow data and the low ambient luminance and environmental zone of sections of the Scheme (such as Fontwell Avenue)'. As highlighted in the ecology and landscaping sections above, the ES seemingly assumes that the lighting can and would be dimmed and/or turned off; during late night hours; at certain bat sensitive locations (in particular those proximate to the PROW crossing point); and during ecologically sensitive periods. However, it remains unclear how/if this can be controlled, whether the luminaries specified in the Street Lighting Layout Drawings include such controls, which lighting installations would be subject to any particular restriction, the duration of such periods, the reduction in brightness likely to be required, and confirmation as to whether reduced lighting would be sufficient to ensure highway safety. Please clarify and consider an outline lighting management scheme.</p>	<p>A review of lighting classes based on traffic flows, ambient luminance and environmental zone has been carried out and it is not anticipated there needs to be any change to the lighting design and therefore anticipated impacts. A commitment has been made by SSE and WSCC to switch off / dim lighting as needed and this is detailed within a newly created Outline Lighting Management Scheme (Attached to Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES) which also provides commentary on traffic safety.</p>	<p>P24 of the Revised Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES). The Outline Lighting Management Scheme is now included as an appendix (B) of the Lighting Assessment Report.</p>

78	Lighting	<p>• The Street Lighting Layout Drawings provide specifications for proposed luminaires, however, it would be useful for illustrative examples of such lighting to be provided. Further, noting that the assessment concludes at some properties that 'it is unlikely that existing vegetation or fencing in front of the property will provide screening from light intrusion or luminous intensity but may benefit from additional luminaire shields and louvers being installed for the lighting on the proposed roundabout', the drawings should clearly identify any luminaires where additional treatment would be installed, and the assessment needs to confirm that the effect of such mitigation would be sufficient.</p>	<p>Illustrative examples of luminaires have been included on Page 19 of the Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES). Regarding shields, while these can be beneficial, these are not essential to the assessment of lighting effects. If needed / requested these can be retrospectively applied in consultation with SSE / WSCC.</p>	<p>p19 and 25 of Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES (Revised Lighting Assessment Report).</p>
79	Lighting	<p>There are inconsistencies in highway layouts shown on the Street Lighting Layout Drawings and Design drawings (e.g. pedestrian facilities at the northern limb of Fontwell Avenue roundabout). Update/amend as necessary.</p>	<p>Updated lighting drawings have been provided by SSE. These are appended to the Outline Lighting Management Scheme (Appendix B of Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES).</p>	<p>Appended to the Outline Lighting Management Scheme (Appended to Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES).</p>
80	Lighting	<p>With reference to the comments of the South Downs National Park Authority (dated 18th December 2020), clarification is sought as to whether lighting has been minimised in terms of the number and frequency of luminaires, and specifications to minimise the impact upon dark skies.</p>	<p>Lighting has been minimised and is appropriate for its level of usage and setting. A reduction in lighting is proposed for the sections of carriageway between roundabouts where only the cycleways have been lit leaving the road unlit which provides the benefit of reduced column heights and lightings levels along these sections.</p>	<p>p 24 of the Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES)</p>
81	Lighting	<p>There is a need to demonstrate that due consideration has been given to any potential lighting impacts on the future development of site allocation (SD5 - Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate) as a sensitive receptor. Given the proximity and noting the light contours highlighted by light spill contours as shown on the Street Lighting Layout Drawings, focus should be given to the Barratts David Wilson Homes development, and land adjacent (south) of the proposed Barnham Road roundabout. Any assessment should ensure any additional mitigation is clearly identified (e.g. further shields/louvers) and the extent to which the proposed scheme has considered or may limit opportunities for integration into neighbouring future development sites.</p>	<p>The final location of future residential development within the BEW development have not been fixed at the time of writing, however, consideration has been given to the cumulative effects of lighting. It has been concluded that there are no significant lighting effects anticipated for these proposed developments.</p>	<p>p 27 of the Lighting Assessment Report (Appendix 10.2 of the Revised ES)</p>
82	Additional info	<p>Please clarify the rationale for the location of northern bus stop and associated stretch of footpath. What consideration has been given to the potential for the likelihood of crossing of the carriageway opposite the bus stop?</p>	<p>Bus stop details and location were determined by providing the 70m Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) sight line for the driver to see a pedestrian waiting to cross, as described in Chapter 3 and shown on drawing A29-CAP-HGN-00-SK-C-0186 in Appendix 3.1.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 and Appendix 3.1</p>
83	Additional info	<p>It is noted that the description of development includes reference to 'signalised pedestrian crossings' which is not proposed. Please ensure any description of development is accurate to the development proposed.</p>	<p>Description in 1.1.3 has been edited to remove reference to signalised crossing. It now reads "The construction of a 1.3km single carriageway with a 3m wide shared cycleway / footway, one uncontrolled pedestrian crossing to enable users of the PRow to cross the carriageway, three roundabouts, provision of hard and soft landscaping, road markings, traffic signals, bus stops, and signalised pedestrian crossings, construction of a substation building; installation of a noise barrier, and other associated works"</p>	<p>Chapter 1 and 3 of the Revised ES</p>
84	Additional info	<p>In addition to specific consultation responses referred to in this letter, the applicant is encouraged to review all consultation responses and third-party representations received in respect of the planning application (available on the WSCC website) and provide responses to the key issues raised.</p>	<p>The individual responses have been reviewed and clarifications provided within the Revised ES and ES Addendum. A response to Parish Council comments has been prepared and circulated in a letter to the Parish Councils.</p>	

85	To Be Addressed	<p>Noting the findings of the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (and with reference to the comments of The WSCC Tree Officer/Ecologist/Landscape consultant, and the South Downs National Park Authority) the proposed landscaping and ecological mitigation strategy should be reviewed to seek to ensure performance against the BNG Good Practice Principles is improved and to achieve a 10% biodiversity net gain across the development.</p>	<p>The landscape design has evolved following submission and 52m of additional hedgerow has been included which means that the linear features achieve a biodiversity net gain of 10%, as such the Scheme will achieve a BNG of 10%. Text has been updated in Chapter 3 and further discussed within the Ecology Chapter (Chapter 9). Appendix 9.10 (BNG Final Assessment) has been edited to reflect the updates to the landscape design and achievement of BNG.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 and 9 of the Revised ES. Appendix 9.10 (BNG Final Assessment).</p>
86	To Be Addressed	<p>To reduce and where possible offset or compensate for any significant adverse landscape and visual effects, consideration should be given to further ecological mitigation and landscape enhancement opportunities as identified in the Ecological Assessment, the Green Infrastructure Strategy, and as raised by third parties and consultees. Examples include provision of hop-over planting, gapping up of surrounding features, extension of the LMMP periods, additional hedgerow planting (e.g. as boundary treatments at the closed Barnham Road Halo access, west and south of the proposed Fontwell Avenue roundabout etc.), replacement of the flint wall feature, additional tree planting, planting on roundabouts, improved replacement orchard design, consideration of additional wildflower grassland in place of amenity grassland, further cross-highway connections, and maximising ecological value of attenuation ponds.</p>	<p>Landscape design has advanced since submission of the planning application in October 2020. In addition to the incorporation of an additional 52m of hedgerow which provides the Scheme with overall Biodiversity Net Gain of 10%, the landscape design is evolving to replace remaining areas of amenity grassland with wildflower meadow. Further opportunities for inclusion of trees have been investigated with due consideration of safety (sight lines), including additional planting north of Barnham Road, alongside Greenacre. There are no opportunities to include tree planting within the proposed roundabouts at Fontwell Avenue and Barnham Road due to the presence of services and drainage features below the surface. However, three individual trees have been included within the central roundabout and these are shown on the revised landscape plans (Appendix 3.3 of the Revised ES).</p> <p>Edits to the Halo entrance have been made in negotiation with the landowner, and the landscape design updated accordingly. The Planting Schedule (Appendix 10.3 of the Revised ES) has been updated in consultation with the WSCC County Ecologist and County Arboriculturist. Further details of the wider connectivity and integration with Barratts landscape design can be found in new appendices to the Revised ES including Appendix 3.6 - Wider landscape plan and Appendix 14.2 - Integration Statement in relation to Barratt David Wilson Homes development. The final maintenance schedule for the landscape features will be secured with a planning condition. Further detail in relation to the attenuation ponds is provided in a new Appendix (Appendix 3.1b of the Revised ES).</p> <p>The Late Victorian former garden wall that requires removal to accommodate the new roundabout at Fontwell Avenue is approximately 10m in length and partially obscured by vegetation. Opportunities to relocate were investigated, however, due to the space constraints in this area opportunities to relocate the flint wall are limited.</p>	<p>Appendix 3.1b, 3.3, 3.6, 10.4 and 14.2 of the Revised ES)</p>
87	To Be Addressed	<p>Consider opportunities to provide further planting to aid in softening the appearance and bulk of the proposed acoustic barrier, in particular from the west (road) side, should be considered. Consider potential use of climbers or use of a 'green screen' to further reduce the impact of this barrier.</p>	<p>The distance between the noise barrier and the road edge limits the opportunity for landscape planting. Signs will be installed on approach to Barnham Road roundabout as such sight lines will need to be maintained. Further, access to the western side of the noise barrier is required for maintenance purposes. It should be noted that landscape planting will restrict views of the barrier by future residents to the west of the road. Wildflower planting at the base of the noise barrier will provide some seasonal screening. Climbers have been incorporated into the Planting Schedule (Appendix 10.3) including ivy, honeysuckle and clematis. The material finish of the noise barrier including soft landscape screening will be secured with a planning condition.</p>	<p>Appendix 10.3 (Planting Schedule) of the Revised ES</p>
88	To Be Addressed	<p>You will see from Parish Council and third-party responses that there have been several concerns, and in some cases disagreement, with the conclusions of the Environmental Statement and supporting technical appendices. This is particularly the case in relation to the landscape and visual impact assessment and impacts on ecology. We would therefore advise that you review, amend as necessary and update the assessments in the light of the preparation and submission of the additional information listed above.</p>	<p>The comments from the Parish Council and individual stakeholders have been reviewed and a separate response prepared in relation to the issues raised by the Parish Councils. The comments have been taken on board and opportunities investigated to increase planting (including on roundabouts) and increasing the area of wildflower meadow. Edits have been made to chapter 3 in particular to provide clarifications and further details provided in relation to comments on cumulative impacts through the inclusion of a cumulative section within each of the topic chapters.</p>	<p>Chapters 3, 6-13 of the Revised ES</p>
89	To Be Addressed	<p>With regard to the design of the proposed acoustic barrier (which is currently unclear) it is recommended that you submit further justification of how the materials selected would ensure a structure that seeks to protect the character and quality of the area and contribute towards best practice placemaking principles, through high quality design.</p>	<p>Further details of the noise optioneering study have been included in Section 4.4. (Chapter 4 - Consideration of Alternatives). Table 4.3 provides details of the barrier types considered and reasons for discounting. The noise modelling identified the requirement for a 3m high barrier. The height and acoustic specifications noted in Section 4.4.2 are fixed. However, the colour, material type and finish are to be secured with a planning condition. This text has been included in Chapter 3 - 3.1.75</p>	<p>Chapter 3 of the Revised ES</p>

90	S257	<p>Following our discussions, you will be aware that a Section 257 application will be required for the proposed permanent realignment of the existing footpath (FP 318). Such an application, although must run concurrently with a planning application, is a distinct process and as such will need to be submitted under separate cover. Where the further information sought would require amended plans, they should be allocated a new 'revision' number and any plans to be superseded should be identified. It is also advised that the information should be presented in a single supplementary submission</p>	<p>The S257 application has been submitted separately and associated plans within the document updated to ensure consistency with the Revised ES.</p>	
----	------	---	---	--