



## **RESPONSE FROM BARNHAM AND EASTERGATE PARISH COUNCIL TO PLANNING APPLICATION WSCC/052/20**

Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council have studied the current consultation, together with their previously submitted objection and the responses received from WSCC to that objection, and have concluded that nothing in the responses has removed **any** of our previous concerns and we would therefore wish our originally submitted objections to stand as below.

It is our opinion that WSCC has failed to take account of legitimate, serious concerns resulting in unsustainable, and in some cases dangerous planning; and that the identified shortcomings have to be fully corrected before planning permission is given.

### **Land to the north of Eastergate and north-west of Barnham, PO22 0DF**

#### **Proposal**

The construction of a 1.3km single carriageway with a 3m wide shared cycleway/footway, 2.5m wide central island, one uncontrolled pedestrian crossing with a central island 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 associated works

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Barnham and Eastergate Parish Council objects to this planning application and is agreed that the current planning application should be rejected. The subsequent sections of this report provide evidence for these objections in detail, with Appendices of supporting material.

- **Failure to meet the ADC Local Plan Policies H SP2 SD5.** This application demonstrates very poor compliance with the Local Plan policies; fails completely to determine the cumulative impact on the existing settlements regarding but not limited to future traffic volumes; 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.
- **Failure to meet NPPF paragraph 110.** This application does not adequately address requirements a) and b), and does not adequately provide evidence for compliance with requirement c)
- **Environmental impacts.** This application fails to address several issues that require further mitigation and redesign including:
  - Noise pollution
  - Air pollution
  - Adverse impact on the Arun District Council-approved Coast to the South Downs Green Infrastructure Masterplan
  - Failure to protect, conserve or enhance the natural environment, landscapes and biodiversity as per ADC Local Plan Policies H SP2

- Misleading representation of ‘mature’ planting in video presentation, a state which will take several years to achieve
    - Poor visual amenity in particular with regard to the acoustic fencing.
- **Flooding and drainage.** There is huge local concern that the new road – most of which is elevated to a degree above surrounding land - will effectively dam the natural flow of ground water and increase flooding risk for existing dwellings. The two attenuation ponds are shown to discharge into a ditch that currently drains existing dwellings and is regarded as incapable of handling additional flows. History in this area includes severe flooding in Barnham Village centre caused by the Lidsey Rife and the remedial works needed to the A27 in 1994. Management plans since then have stopped catastrophic flooding but 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 must address these concerns adequately and 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.
- **Road safety.** The current design fails to deliver safe routes and crossings for walking, cycling and all other non-traffic users.
- **Traffic forecasts.** The planning application appendices are detailed and incomplete in areas. The conclusions from the traffic impact analysis defy any ‘common-sense’ test as the cumulative impact of SD5 and other planning-approved housing growth and the growing flows of traffic from Bognor Regis will be far higher than stated and certainly are far below expected demand from new development. Presentation of the cumulative effects on traffic growth, as a consequence of the Local Plan and future housing targets, must be presented in a transparent way alongside the proposed mitigation measures. This application demonstrates that this subject has not been addressed adequately.

## STATEMENT OF POSITION

BEPC and many residents in the parish – a significant number of whom have volunteered their time to study the multifarious documentation of the application - are frustrated that so much detail is missing from the appendices. There are concerns about the implications of consistent failures to provide adequate public consultation and meaningful engagement with local residents, with little or no evidence of public consultations resulting in ameliorations to the plans over the last two years. For example, the road alignment has not materially moved west from residential properties in Murrell Gardens as repeatedly requested in 2019 consultations. In 2020 the overwhelming desires of the public have been completely ignored with regard to the material selection for the noise barrier.

The design process has clearly continued during the statutory public consultation process which is dissatisfactory. BEPC believes that the deficiencies and omissions in this application are material and further public consultation on a revised design is required. In this regard the Planning Committee needs to insist on an audit as we believe there are many non-compliances with regard to local and national directives/guidance within the detail of this application. We have highlighted the most concerning areas but many residents’ questions of detail remain unanswered and the impression is that this application is being pushed through the process with little or no regard to the repeated feedback that this parish council and residents have provided.

We in this community live everyday with the current traffic levels and environmental impact and don't see how this road isn't going to have an unacceptable impact on the community if certain things in the proposal are not properly addressed. BEPC therefore object to this planning application and seek its rejection.

**COMPLIANCE WITH ADC LOCAL PLAN POLICY**

Strategic Site Allocations Policy H SP2 states that the comprehensive development of the allocation will need to meet key requirements including:

Policy as Described in the Local Plan	WSSC/052/20 Non-Compliance
<p>Development proposals within the Strategic Site Allocations must be comprehensively planned and should have regard to a masterplan endorsed by the Council for the respective areas which incorporates high quality imaginative design giving a sense of place and a permeable layout.</p>	<p>There is no endorsed masterplan for SD5 North when this application was submitted. The relationship between the proposed road and the proposed housing development was not presented in the 2020 masterplan consultations and is not presented in this application.</p> <p>This planning application should not be considered until the public has been able to review and comment on the masterplan. For SD5 North the 'masterplan' that was consulted on in 2020 lacked detail with regard to the spatial design of the housing development and other material aspects including site access and location of the care home facility; a comprehensive masterplan needs to be brought to the public, meeting the same standard of detail as SD5 South.</p>
<p>Integrate appropriately with surrounding communities through an appropriate design particularly where they adjoin by providing for public realm improvements, shared community uses, and connectivity of transport modes including walking, cycling and public transport.</p>	<p>The planning application is non-compliant as described in the Traffic and Road Safety sections of this document.</p>
<p>Ensure a clear and harmonious relationship between town and country including clearly defined boundaries, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.</p>	<p>As communicated by BEPC in all previous consultations the route of the road, as presented, is too close to existing residential areas (17m distant) to allow the installation of satisfactory environmental separation between the new road and long established existing local housing. BEPC also believes that there will be unnecessary damage of a visual, atmospheric and ecological nature to the existing and valued village's landscape character, scale and environmental qualities.</p> <p>BEPC wishes to see a new, further west, alignment and relocation of the Halo site. An adjustment of 10m in the line of the eastern boundary would be sufficient</p>

Policy as Described in the Local Plan	WSCC/052/20 Non-Compliance
Protects, conserves or enhances the natural environment, landscapes and biodiversity.	The planning application in non-compliant as described in the Environment section of this document.
Incorporate high quality, well connected green spaces, planting within main streets and biodiversity rich open spaces.	
Extend, enhance and reinforce strategic green infrastructure and publicly accessible open space	
Ensure walkable access to local community, recreational and shopping facilities, jobs and accessible transport,	The planning application in non-compliant as described in the Traffic and Road Safety sections of this document.

## LANDSCAPE STRATEGY

The application states the following:

***The aims of the landscape proposals are to improve biodiversity, provide screening for a noise barrier and to enhance legibility and connectivity. The proposals sit within the broader overarching principles outlined in the A29 Green Infrastructure Strategy (2020).***

The Landscape Strategy is a series of 5 drawings, covering the road zone from the proposed roundabout at Fontwell Avenue to the proposed roundabout in Barnham Road, and additionally includes a balancing pond south of Barnham Road. To appreciate the mitigation impacts of the landscape scheme BEPC was advised by WSCC Project Management to look at the 'Fly through' – at a height considerably higher than pedestrian or vehicle occupant eye-line - video produced for the scheme. Having done this the Council view is that the Landscape Strategy drawings indicate significantly less mitigation planting than the video shows. Further details on this and the specific planting schedules are shown in the Appendix attached to this response.

## TRAFFIC FORECASTS AND ROAD SAFETY

### Summary Issues:

- Traffic forecasts seem far below expected demand from new development using WSCC highways formulae.
- Key roundabout saturation and consequent congestion risk underestimated.
- Consequent dangerous traffic growth in local lanes without foot paths.
- Evidence which might explain shortcomings is not presented.
- No details given for Planning Statement signalised pedestrian crossings or safe/accessible crossings.
- No Non-Motorised User (NMU) (pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders etc.) survey.
- RSA overlooked access and safety needs of the existing 9,000-strong community.

Further detailed commentary is contained in the Appendix to this response.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The Council sought advice and comment on the EIA document from a specialist ecologist and environmental consultant and wish to submit the following comments from that report.

As the whole, the document is a good one. However, this is the time to shape and influence the process, and we wish to make the consultants aware that the Parish Council understand the assets that they are charged with exploring the risks of impact too and would wish to see engagement with the Council to ensure that the final scope of the document is appropriate.

Specific comments noted are as follows:

**1.6.7 Ecology.** Habitats are recognised but understated, designations are not. The hedgerow is ancient, as are some of the trees within it. Both are priority habitats in the National Planning Policy Framework Guidelines and furthermore orchards are too. As far as designations are concerned, there are TPOs on a number of the Veteran Trees.

The consultant engaged by the Parish Council has also highlighted that the hedgerow forms a commuting corridor and foraging habitat for bats, and that also is a consideration addressed in the aforementioned guidance.

There is a maternity colony of barbastelle bats (EU annexe 2 species) recorded as breeding within 2km (if not 5km, their level of consideration) of the site, in the Slindon Bottom Site Important for Nature Conservation (SINC), and they are likely to use the above corridor too.

**2.3.1 Geographic Scope** Should recognise commuting too, as above

**7.2.2 Noise and Vibration, Baseline Conditions** Needs to address priority habitats, veteran trees and orchards, ancient hedgerows and wildlife commuting corridor

**8.2 Ecology, Baseline Conditions** as above, and the same for Slindon Bottom SINC and barbastelle colony. Reference is made to the SNCI (Site of Nature Conservation), they are now SINCS and have been for some time.

**8.1 Table** makes reference to only 7 species of bat, our consultant has recorded 8. Also, no mention of grass snakes, which must be there and are under recorded.

### **Flood Risk Assessment Appendix 11.1**

#### **Primary Concerns;**

- 1) The contractor has requested, and been given permission by WSCC/ADC, NOT TO RESPECT the requirement from CIRIA C753 (the national SUDS Manual) paragraph 13.2 that there should be 1 metre of unsaturated ground below SUDS infiltration facilities. This can lead to poorer drainage performance and contamination of ground water from A29 NTI scheme ponds 1 & 2.
- 2) The ADC Principal Drainage Engineer requested that the 2 attenuation ponds should utilise both infiltration and direct discharge to local ditches, to minimise the flow into the ditches and thus minimise the risk of downstream flooding in Barnham. That request could not be accommodated because, due to ground water levels higher than the base of those ponds, the ponds have had to be lined.
- 3) Item (2) above further increases the likelihood that this road scheme will exacerbate the risk of

surface water flooding in Barnham village centre.

- 4)** All the drawings within Appendix 11.1 Appendix E1 & E2 are incomplete with their right hand sides missing. How is the BEPC and the public expected to understand and review the proposed drainage design?