5 OXFORD ROAD WORTHING WEST SUSSEX BN11 1XG
TELEPHONE [redacted]

WORTHING BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING SECTION
RECEIVED 24 AUG 2011
On Comp. | In Report (D/C)
Addm. | Post Addm.

James Appleton Esq
Head of Planning, Regeneration & Wellbeing
Adur & Worthing Planning Services
Portland House
Richmond Road
WORTHING BN 11 1LF

Your Reference 10/0852/OUT: Teville Gate 22nd August 2011

Dear Mr. Appleton

Thank you for your letter of the 4th August advising me that amended plans have now been received for the above application indicating a revised highway approach to traffic signals and pedestrian crossings following negotiations with the WSCC Highways Agency.

The Briefing Notes submitted on the 2nd August contain substantial amounts of data and analysis. However, they are all based on the statement in Note 22, page 1, that "It was agreed at an early stage that any solution involving retention of roundabouts would not deliver the required pedestrian accessibility improvements." these apparently being the aspirations of both the Worthing Borough Council and the Applicant for good quality pedestrian links for the development. Accordingly there are estimates of how long pedestrians and cyclists would have to wait at various crossings but, as far as I can tell, no comparable estimates for how long road vehicles (buses, commercial lorries and private cars) would have to wait at the junction. Giving possible numbers of cars waiting in a queue isn't quite the same thing. Is this an oversight, or doesn't it really matter what impact the proposals would have on vehicles entering and leaving Worthing by the main A24 Northern Gateway?

At present, outside peak times and with the roundabouts in place to facilitate such movements, a high proportion of traffic passes through the junctions without stopping at all. If the roundabouts are replaced by 8 sets of pedestrian controlled traffic lights then some road traffic will be brought to a halt from one direction or another at all times of the day and night. This simply must mean raised levels of pollution from noise and exhaust fumes which will seriously affect residents living close to the junctions i.e. in Norfolk House, Phoenix House, on Teville Road and possibly even occupants of the proposed twin towers. To gain some idea of the impact of these proposals on road journey times I would draw attention to the experience of passengers travelling from the town centre on buses 1, 5 or 7. In order to get over the railway bridge on Broadwater Road these buses would need to pass through 12 sets of traffic lights! Timetables would surely be in need of significant rewriting.

Should such priority be given to pedestrian accessibility to and from the development area when it was readily agreed at the planning meeting on the 29th June that the scheme was not likely to lead to a substantial increase in linked trips to and from the town centre? I do hope that our town planners and members of the Development Control sub Committee will take these factors fully into account when making their final decisions on this aspect of the scheme.

Yours sincerely

[redacted] David Lutwyche for the CWRA.

I have enclosed a copy of my speech delivered on 29th June for information.

Copy of 2 minute speech given to Development Control Committee meeting on 29th June 2011

TEVILLE GATE

David Lutwyche representing Central Worthing Residents' Association.

It is widely accepted that development and regeneration of Teville Gate is long overdue.

The desirability and suitability of high rise blocks of flats on this site are debatable. I quite like the revised shape of the twin towers but others don't. With town planners, councillors and local journalists amongst many others full of excitement at the prospect of an "iconic" building at the northern gateway to Worthing we expect approval for the latest Outline Planning Application to be granted as before.

The benefits of the latest proposals for both residents and visitors are well documented in the Applicant's Supporting Statements and the Planning Assessment. There is no need for me to repeat them, though I have doubt that the scheme will really lead to a substantial increase in linked trips to the town centre. Users of the foodstore, cinema or fitness centre are unlikely to then walk down Chapel Road in large numbers.

Perhaps understandably, disadvantages of the scheme are barely acknowledged in the Application. For example, on page 13 of the report under Transportation and Access, it is claimed that traffic generated by the Development "would not create significant additional congestion at the majority of junctions", and "car-parking provision is sufficient to meet the anticipated demand. The effect is therefore negligible" – quite a statement to make alongside estimates of 10000 arrivals and departures in any 24 hour period! The Transport Assessment summary, on page 30, mentions Pedestrians 8 times and Cyclists 5 times but little or nothing about road traffic until it ends with the conclusion "it is considered that there are no reasons in highway or traffic terms why the proposed development should not be granted planning consent".

Fortunately, on pages 72 – 74 the Planning Assessment does acknowledge the existence of problems over the road junctions and car-parking provision. The claim that "even without the development the existing roundabouts would fail in 2016 with queues of 176 cars stretching back 850 metres" and, by implication, that this might be solved by replacing them with pedestrian controlled, all red, crossings is a little hard for anyone to swallow! No final solution to the problem of "trying to reconcile the desire for improved pedestrian movement with the need to ensure the free flow of traffic" has so far been published. Also, "Clearly, it will be important to balance the level of car-parking provided ...to avoid additional on-street parking pressures."

I would urge members of the committee to bear all this in mind when making any final decision on this application.

[redacted]