Teal Planning

The Brentano Suite
Solar House 915 High Road North Finchley
Lond on N12 8QJ

[redacted]

www.tealplan.com

23" July 2021

Lancing 4th Arm Application
Note in Response to Matters Raised
at the Adur Planning Committee Meetingof
19th July 2021

Dear Jane and James

The following sets out a response to matters raised by members of ADC's Planning Committee and the public speakers who spoke in objection to the 4th arm application at the meeting held on 19th July 2021.

ADC's Committee members approved the application subject to delegated matters (6 votes in favour and 2 against).

We consider it would be helpful to ADC and SDNPA officers if the following responses could be noted. This note does not provide a verbatim record of the points raised at the meeting. It aims to acknowledge and address all relevant planning matters where further clarification might be usefu,l during ADC's delegated period and in advance of the SDNPA's consideration of the application on 12th August 2021.

Member Questions and Clarifications

1. ***Implications of the legal speed limit of Coombes Road being 60mph and of GPS/Satnavs potentially routing traffic along the 4th arm when the Stenyning Road (A283) is very busy. Even though the practical speed limit of the road is lower, the GPS!Satnav recordings may suggest that the route is more convenient than it is and result in increased traffic diverting via Coombes Road; with the convenience of the 4th arm adding to this. Can the speed limit be reduced to ensure Satnavs correctly account for the nature of Coombes Road and not inadvertently encourage additional traffic along***

it?

The concerns raised about GPS systems diverting traffic along Coombes Road should be taken to apply equally if not more so to both the existing road layout and the approved NMF arrangements off Coombes Road. The difference being that the proposed layout will induce congestion and queueing once a vehicle has followed their SATNAV into Coombes Road, which is not the same as with the existing road, whereby a vehicle following their SATVAV does not currently suffer congestion in the narrow pinch point of Sussex Pad hamlet. Both of these arrangements utilise the faster A27 trunk road more for north bound traffic and in the case of the existing arrangement for both ways traffic, compared with the proposed arrangement that will divert traffic along the slower 4th arm route.

The 4!h arm has the benefit of being designed to slow traffic speeds between the exit off the new roundabout and just north of the fork in the road between Coombes Road east and west. It is good to see that the applicant is willing to admit that this proposal will slow traffic flow through the pinch-point which will induce congestion. These measures include gate markers, speed signs, the pinch point, changes in surface treatments and bollards. These will slow traffic, provide a more tranquil entrance to the SDNP and will affect the relative attractiveness of the route for potential rat-running compared with both the existing and the approved arrangements. The new route therefore equates to a benefit in overall traffic management terms.

Beyond this and outside of the application area along the north end of Coombes Road, it will be for the County Council and Police enforcement authorities to assess whether it is appropriate for speed limits to be changed. This is a matter for outside of the 4t^ arm application and again applies equally if not more so to the existing and approved NMF arrangements.

Lancing College will be very happy to actively support any appropriate changes to nearby local speed limits along the north end of Coombes Road and to be a local consultee to any such proposal, but again this is not matter for this application.

1. *What* are *the largest HGVs that will* use *the 4t* arm, will* I/ie number increase *and will* I/iere dy *a limit on the* size *of vehicles*

   The 4t^ arm will not alter the nature or number of HGVs accessing properties on Coombes Road. There will be no size limit on HGVs using the 4!h arm — all properties and businesses will still be fully and conveniently accessed by all service and emergency vehicles. The pinch point will not affect access but it will set vehicles away from properties at the Sussex Pad. The applicant has missed the point raised at the planning meeting. We did not question the size of HGV's able to utilize the proposed layout, but raised the issue of the largest HGV's being both the cause of congestion whilst trying to traverse the Sussex Pad Hamlet pinch point, and being delayed due to congestion in the same area. It seems logical to conclude that large HGV's traversing a pinch point road scheme "*designed to slow traffic speeds between the exit off the new roundabout and just north of the fork in the road between Coombes Road east and west*", during peak traffic periods that correspond to College drop off and pick up points, will induce and suffer congestion and queuing. Importantly, the 4!h arm will prevent west bound heavy goods vehicles from having to circulate around the Stenyning flyover junction, with significant advantages for the operational efficiency of the service companies and for related emissions. It is interesting that the applicant does not however point out that HGV's wishing to travel east, will under this proposal have to queue/travel in a west bound direction, before waiting to enter the east bound flow of the A27.

2. *Does Ikea's decision not* to *locate at NIYIF change the assessment of the capacity of the* /l27 *and* ffie *functioning of the* new *roundabout.*

   As outlined by James at the meeting, an alternative use of the Ikea site will be able to progress in accordance with the operational conditions set out for the site within the existing NMF permission or will need to apply to operate differently with different opening hours etc. They will need to take into account the operation of the 4t^ arm and traffic counts associated with it. The new roundabout is still needed to serve the NMF development and the airport.

3. *If HE does not support the* refenfion *of the approved* Coombes *Road* /eff *in — left out* junction *with the 4^ arm included, what are the implications of this.*

   Highways England has been consistent and clear over many years that they will not accept the 4th arm **as well as** the Coombes Road junction remaining open. As outlined by James, the implications of an application that proposes this is that HE would direct refusal. HE are clearly saying that it will only support one or the other scheme, not a combination of both. This is fine by the majority of businesses on the Coombes Road, as we are asking for the approved left-in-left-out scheme to be maintained and the 4th arm proposal to be declined, in order to limit congestion in the Sussex pad hamlet area. This being the case, HE should have no issue supporting our position.

Objector Comments

1. *Mr D Johnson, CRPE* Sussex
This is a cruel, wrong-headed, cynical, application — both unnecessary and confusing • the *wrong* hammer to *crack the wrong nut. Supposedly a solution, it only* creates *problems* there ffiere were none *before.*

It is not an application to save journey limes to the *A27 for College users* dut *for a new through route across the National Park.*

We refer you to Lancing College's Statement. The 4t^ arm is proposed only as mitigation for the effects of the approved NMF scheme and the need for this was acknowledged in response to the NMF application. The application is not seeking to provide an improvement to the long established access of the College, but only to keep an all routes access on and off the A27 that the College, its staff, pupils, suppliers and visitors rely on. We, the wider business community of the Coombes Road area, have pointed out to ADC and SDNP that this 4th arm proposal is purely being put forward by the applicant to benefit their one, singular business. The applicant and their agents do not deny this fact, yet we ask why it is right that ADC have decided that the applicant's one business should take priority over the 13 other businesses also reliant upon the access of the Coombes Road from the A27, all of which disagree with the applicant that their proposal is better than the approved left-in-left-out scheme.This includes visitors to the National Park which the Park has a clear remit to provide for and to encourage. The 4!^ arm will simply re-create the all-ways access Lancing College (and the wider community) has now but with better traffic calming. It will not create a super highway into the Park.

This is not a cynical application, but an attempt to secure the future of Lancing College and its wealth of social and environmental programmes (the basis of which is supported by Historic England). Again, we ask why this one business should take presedent over the other 13 businesses in the area? The Application is the result of 3 years of joint working and has been informed by landscape and environmental studies, along with significant dialogue with Highways England, West Sussex County Council, Adur District Council and the South Downs National Park. Yet either by design or poor judgement, the College failed to discuss their plan or gain consensus support for a plan that would suit all concerned before embarking on this 3 year plan! We do not believe that the favoring of just one individual private business, is justification for a local authority to pass an infrastructural proposal that affects multiple businesses, residents and the SDNP environment alike.

It will result in light pollution, scar ffie *national park, take up* frees, *and attract* new *traffic. It is being used* dy
Highways England to justify the t/nnecessa/y c/osure *of the* Coombes *Road ¡ • nction creating* more *traffic.*

The Highways Authority again has been consistent throughout in relation to the number of junctions that will be permitted here.

All environmental impacts have been fully and robustly appraised and the proposals have been amended as requested. The 4t^ arm route around the Pad has been selected following pre-application consultation with the SDNPA taking into account the need to minimise the extent of new carriageway. It is also nested along the embankment, set back from the A27 and the road has been designed to minimise the need for lighting in full accordance with the SDNPA's Dark Skies policies. Where trees will be lost they will be replaced and added to, with new native, broad leaf varieties. The screening of the 4!^ arm and the part closure with linked new planting will reduce the visual impact of the 4!^ arm and provide a BNG of over 20% (excluding the addition of the north field enhancements). The road will be unlit other than a short section close to the A27 in an area already subject to light spill from existing A27 highway lighting. These are all good words but the fact remains that if the approved left-in-left-out scheme is constructed, which utilizes the current road surface and route, no trees, shrubs or grassed areas will be lost or indeed need replacement. Therefore the currently concented 3 arm scheme is more environmentally acceptable, despite the applicants attempt to disguise this fact. The road will facilitate access to the SDNP which is a remit and objective of the Park Authority, this includes for all existing residents located west of Coombes Road and future new residents within the NMF development. The 4th arm will encourage vehicle user and NMU visitors by providing a more tranquil entrance to the Park from the NMF roundabout and ensuring vehicle users do not have to divert around the flyover.

It is against the Park's primary objective conservation promotion, sustainable transport, cycling and walking strategies. The road damages landscapes, lives and wellbeing and is an unnecessary incursion into the National Park

The 4th arm will reduce the length of vehicle miles travelled with associated linked impacts and provides a more sustainable vehicle routing option compared with the approved NMF scheme. This statement simply ignores the fact that all east bound traffic leaving the Coombes Road, will have to travel/queue in a westerly direction first so as to access the A27 at the new roundabout, before turning east. It further ignores the fact that all traffic wishing to enter the Coombes road from an Easterly direction, will have to travel in a westerly direction past the current entrance to the Coombes Road, before returning to the coombes road in an easterly direction. These facts double the mileage for these vehicles, something the applicant seems to ignore.

It will provide a convenient access for NMUs and within a more tranquil approach set back and screened from the A27 compared with the existing arrangement and the approved NMF scheme.

Landscape impacts are minimised, mitigated and supported by significant enhancements, linked with the transfer of the north field to species rich planting. Again, these are all good words but the fact remains that if the approved left-in-left-out scheme is constructed, which utilizes the current road surface and route, no trees, shrubs or grassed areas will be lost or indeed need replacement. Therefore the currently concented 3 arm scheme is more environmentally

acceptable, despite the applicants attempt to disguise this fact.

The ability to protect Lancing College's operations, funding streams and ability to continue to fund its estate management programmes, which include habitat management and enhancement and the maintenance of its significant heritage assetsthat act as a landmark within and gateway attraction to the National Park, fully meet the National Park's conservation protection, promotion and enhancement objectives. The focus on one business is breath-taking. This statement by the applicant may or may not be true, but what if the adoption of this proposed scheme undermines all of the other agricultural businesses in the wider Coombes Road area? This would negate all the positives gained by the applicant's one private business.

Its impact is on the National Park, it will funnel new traffic around Lancing Estate, attract drive-by drivers to view the Chapel and Downs, bring HGVs past residents, stimulate rat-running and disturb the quiet route for walking, cyclists and horse riders

The funnelling of new traffic around the Lancing College estate and attracting more visitors to view the Chapel and the Downs should be welcomed. It meets a key objective of the Park to improve access. This is especially important in this location where the A27 is recognised by Adur and the SDNPA to act as a major barrier - this currently being both physical and perceived. The long diversion that will be caused by the approved NMF routing plan will only exacerbate this constraint. The 4th arm will mitigate that harm and provide a more attractive, tranquil approach into the Park. Again the applicant is ignoring the negative impacts on traffic movement of the proposed scheme, and SDNP have a duty to evaluate the true effects. All east bound traffic leaving the Coombes Road, will have to travel/queue in a westerly direction first so as to access the A27 at the new roundabout, before turning east. This doubles travel time and length. It further ignores the fact that all traffic wishing to enter the Coombes road from an Easterly direction, will have to travel in a westerly direction past the current entrance to the Coombes Road, before returning to the Coombes road in an easterly direction. These facts double the mileage for these vehicles undertaking these journies, something the applicant seems to ignore regularly.

HGVs will pass residential properties and Lancing Nursery but they will be set back from them. Linked amenity concerns have been fully addressed and agreed. It would be helpful to remember that the Sussex Pad used to a pub and hotel with related visitor traffic and parking.. This is a fact but the road in front of the Pad public house is/was a cul-de-sac and therefore through traffic was not an issue.

The issues of rat-running have been addressed. The 4th arm will be set back and screened from the A27, designed as a country road and will be more tranquil for all users including NMUs. Equestrians are expected to use the new path east of Coombes Road which will still be provided and will be more

tranquil for NMUs given its partial closure to road traffic (it remaining open for Ricardo's traffic only as part of the 4th arm proposals}.

Why can't LC have their own private access and leave the existing access which is possible without spoiling the landscape

There is no way of designing a new private access from the A27 for the College whilst keeping the Coombes Road access open. It would still require an additional junction from the A27 and would result in more significant landscape and ecological harm. Such a drive would either have to still follow the same route as the application scheme (which will result in the same issues the CPRE have raised} but which would not provide the environmental benefits or screening from the A27 that will be provided at the closure of the Coombes Road junction or the drive would need to traverse the steep embankment over the north field. Perhaps the CPRE is thinking an enhanced route from Hoe Court is an option? - that would also be very damaging to the Hoe court fields, public bridleway, listed buildings and campus buildings. The proposed access is the best environmental option. As the applicant has identified, the College already has a dedicated access road from the A27 to their equestrian centre. Without any environmental degradation that road could be used as dedicated access to the College and the Coombes road access could be left as already approved as a left-in-left-out access route. This would eliminate all concerns over the congestion in the Sussex Pad hamlet area.

The application should be refused to avoid its damaging social and economic consequences. Lancing College will survive without the link and the College can then sensibly apply for a private access road.

It is not for the CPRE to suggest they understand Lancing College's operations better that the College itself. An interesting statement considering that Lancing College has design and put forward this 4th arm proposal without any input from the wider business community (some 13+ businesses), and when asked why they thought that appropriate, stated that they knew what is best for all concerned. An arrogant stance at best, and factually wrong as the proposed access design will compromise HGV and emergency service access due to the nature of the design, which will detrimentally affect all businesses along the wider Coombes Road. The Lancing College Statement sets out very clearly the financial position of the College, the legal duties of the College Trustees to protect it operations and how those duties align very closely with those of the SDNPA. The College has only deployed funds to fighting for the protection of its operations and estate because this is so fundamental to its four schools and the continuation of its environmental and public benefits packages. As one of Adur's largest employees, key providers of education and facilities, a major contributor to local supply chains and custodian of a significant gateway estate within the National Park, Lancing College is fighting to protect its operations. If they are harmed this will have significant social and economic consequences

that extend across the wider local community. ***The protection of the College's main access is fundamental to this*** and any organisation that relies on access will appreciate this. The College states that their financial survival depends upon not dissuading a few potential customers from using their school and that their profitability is low single figure percentages. This statement raises a number of questions.

- Will the proposed 4th arm design actually stop the loss of these precious few customers? The addition of another roundabout on the A27 will exacerbate the already terrible queuing and congestion during rush hour periods. Even if the proposed 4th arm design is adopted, the College customers are still going to have to queue on the A27 from the position of the current traffic lights, to the new NMF roundabout, before exiting at the 4th arm and trying to traverse the Sussex Pad Hamlet pinch point. This will add time to their journeys and if, as the applicant says, this additional time is so precious to their customer base, will they lose customers anyway?
- If the profitability of this private business (Lancing College), is so marginal, and as stated only a loss of a few customers will make the difference between profitability or financial deficit, should the planning authorities even be considering a plan that has the potential to detrimentally affect 13 other viable and profitable businesses in order to attempt to assist a business on the knife edge of profitability?
- Would other external factors such as COVID and BREXIT not potentially reduce the applicant's customer base regardless of this 4th arm scheme and therefore render this private business loss making?
- Is it not a fundamental principal that Council/Authority officials have to consider the merits of a proposal against how it will affect all businesses and members of the public, rather than whether a proposal will benefit one private business? By the applicant's own admission and that of the agents acting on their behalf, this 4th arm proposal is purely focused on their own business. They honestly admit that "Lancing College is fighting to protect its operations", and although I admire this stance, the other 13 businesses in the area, and residents of Coombes Road, must not be allowed to suffer in order to potentially gain Lancing College a few more customers.

1. ***Mr B Brock - Coombes Road Business and Residents***
   The application is a response to LC thinking that the approved 3rd arm arrangement may be off-putting to a smallnumbers of their clients.

The 4th arm is not conducive to HVGs and farm vehicles, it will induce congestion, queuing and delay and will be detrimental to all Coombes wider community.

The proposal in essence is the creation of a narrow, winding single lane route at one point, with a pinch point /
bottleneck at the hamlet which will be detriment to all.

These points have already been responded to above. Acknowledging that the 4th arm has been designed to a country road standard - with low key but effective speed controls that accord with the SDNPA's guidance on new road design - is testament to the efforts that officers and the applicants have gone to, to achieve the most appropriate design possible for this location. The applicant and their agent has failed to address these concerns. The Fire & Emergency Services are stipulating that "no compromise of access" will be acceptable through the Sussex Pad Hamlet pinch point. We see no guarantees made to this affect. Highways England have stipulated that no queuing on the proposed slip road leading to the Sussex Pad Hamlet pinch point, will be acceptable if this compromises the A27. They state categorically that this will not be accepted "however unlikely it may be". We see no guarantees made to this affect.

Parish Council seem to have concerns regarding environmental impact and congestion.

The Parish Council has now withdrawn it objections following consideration of the amended plans and additional information that has been provided by the applicants.

The application Environmental Assessment identifies that the Sussex Pad hamlet area will experience major adverse impact. Logically all traffic being forced through the pinch point will therefore experience major adverse impact.

No resulting major adverse impacts have been appraised within the ES. The majority of adverse impacts were considered to be negligible with a small number of minor impacts along with short term moderate construction impacts.

The ES assesses that with the design measures in place (which have subsequently been amended but enhanced in design terms to meet the SDNPA's requests , whilst still satisfying both highway authorities in respect of traffic volumes and facilitiesfor other user groups) there will be the moderate adverse harm to existing highway users along Coombes Road (West) which will be reduced to minor adverse harm. This is within the context of the benefits of removing these trips from the *A2.7* and overall improvements to accessibility . The enhancements secured by the proposal will in turn result in significant environmental benefits. The applicant, its agent and the ES are agreeing that existing businesses and residents of the Coombes Road will suffer "adverse harm", as a result of their scheme, which is purely designed to benefit themselves. As a point of law, is it not of public interest to protect the majority rather than favour the individual?

Highways England have stipulated that there must be no possibility of queuing back to the roundabout. Theapplicant's traffic analysis report seems to point to there being no way of guaranteeing this.

The Traffic Assessment has ignored peak times of the College's pick and drop off points, uses a complex rule of thumb process and highlights that the slip road will only accommodate 21 cars - highlighting that the road will not be sufficient to prevent queuing outside the slip road.

These matters have been addressed in our response of 16th July 2021 *(Response to objections from residents and CPRE).* Have guarantees now been given by the applicant that there is no chance "however unlikely", of queuing back to the A27?

Emergency services have stated they need to be sure that access will be suitable, not blocked or compromised, this must include at peak times. Vehicles having to traverse the pinch point constitutes a compromise.

The pinch point adjacent to the Sussex Pad properties provides a separation of road users from those properties; it does not prevent passing. The setting out of vehicle priority along the 4th arm has been agreed with the highway authorities. There will be no backing up of vehicles that will block the road, with significant space on the carriageway to enable vehicles to stop or temporarily pull over to enable emergency vehicles to pass. A bigger issue of concern should be if emergency vehicles are required to exit Coombes Road to travel west at speed - they will have to divert around the flyover junction under the currently approved NMF arrangement. The 4th arm will provide much better response times. The applicant, or its agent, is again failing to provide the whole story here. The 4th arm scheme would require an emergency vehicle traveling to an incident on the Coombes Road from any location East of the area, to first travel past the current access point to Coombes Road, round the new roundabout, travel back in an easterly direction on the proposed slip road, traverse the Sussex Pad Hamlet pinch point before entering the Coombes Road. This will reduce response times, and if this coincided with the College peak drop off or pick up periods, could cause further delays with serious consequences.

The applicants failed to discuss the proposals with the wider Coombes community before submission. The scheme is focused only on Lancing College's needs. It is not fit for purpose or of benefit to the wider local community.

As demonstrated in the response of 16th July, LC approached residents in April 2018 about the access issues that will arise as a result of the NMF scheme. In spite of significant objections to that proposal from a raft of environmental and access groups, no local residents agreed to work with the College on this. A rumour had been put around that a financial contrition was being sought to support the objections being put forward, which was certainly not the case. As set out in the SCI, submitted with the application, residents at the Pad were consulted on the draft plans before the application was submitted. The north of Coombes Road residents and businesses were not contacted as they will be

less affected by the proposals and the College strongly considers the left in - left out only junction from Coombes Road will be operationally detrimental to local businesses. This statement confirms the applicants lack of respect for all surrounding businesses and residents, the lack of consultation with the affected community, the arrogance of the applicant in thinking they now what is best for other long-standing businesses and should indicate their insular attitude to this proposal, designed purely to benefit themselves. LC has subsequently met with the north of Coombes Road group twice. These meetings being well after the application was made and therefore negating any meaningful input. The attendees for the applicant also stated that they knew best and should be allowed to make decisions for all concerned, and that their design must be allowed to prevail for the good of their business. In short bullying tactics. That group however complained at the Adur Planning Committee meeting that the traffic data is complex. A further meeting to explain the traffic data was offered well before the Committee meeting but this was declined. The truth is not as this would have the reader believe. We asked to be sent the applicants traffic report, which we received. We identified certain statements and data within their own report which are detrimental to their cause and have not been highlighted. We wrote to both ADC and SDNP in order to highlight these issues. The "further meeting to explain the traffic report" was the suggestion of the applicant and we declined as we thought that as with their previous two meetings, they would further belittle, ignore and re-state that they know what is best for the residents and businesses of the area. We saw no benefit to this, hence declined.

2. ***Mr B Freeman AREA - Lancing Residents Network***
The scheme could not be more damaging for local residents, Park users, the Park itself.
The assessments of impacts on the Pad properties have been fully and robustly appraised and agreed with the respective statutory consultees. No mention of meaningful consultation with the actual property owners! Yet again arrogance of ignoring the impact on everyone else in order to benefit one private business.The 4th arm includes new screening from the A27 which will continue to have the most significant effect on the amenity of the Pad properties, taking into account traffic volumes on the A27 and the 4th arm (even at its busiest times) and the setting back of vehicles away from the properties around the Pad.

The proposals mitigate the landscape and ecological impacts of the new road, with significant BNG benefits, in addition to which will be significant additional enhancements that will make a valuable contribution to meeting the SDNPA's new #ReNature initiative. The plans provide improved access, via a more tranquil route for all user groups and without involving the long diversion around the flyover junction for those travelling back west when leaving the National Park from Coombes Road and the College's Drive - thereby encouraging and enabling more visitors to visit and enjoy the Park. As with the entire proposal, the applicant is again ignoring the fact that all traffic entering the Coombes Road from the east, or wishing to exit the Coombes Road and travel east, will have additional mileage, carbon footprint and journey times as a result of this proposed scheme. The proposals do not affect the road further up Coombes Road. We simply cannot accept this illogical statement. ALL residents and businesses that enter the Coombes Road from the south end (which is the majority), will be forced to use the proposed access design regardless of where there destination is on the Coombes

Road. To say otherwise shows a lack of understanding. They simply re-create what is in place now.

Significant tree removal

Trees will be removed but replaced with native broad leaf varieties. The established hedge adjacent to the Lancing College nursery will also be replaced with a new native variety. All well and good but if the approved 3 arm scheme is retained, no trees or hedges will need removal or replacement so benefiting the environment.

Why are Highways England now saying the new slip road is sub-standard *?*

We are not aware of Highways England making any such comment. Both Highways England and West Sussex County Council have confirmed that they are happy for the proposals to be approved subject to condition. They would simply not have any compulsion to do this if they had any concerns about the standard or safety of roads.

The NMF approval was not approved on the basis that the 4th arm I Coombes Road closure would be provided The NMF scheme was deferred by Adur Council given the Council's agreement that Lancing College's access is important to ensuring its operations and contributions. We are concerned that an individual business is being prioritized whilst the needs and potential detrimental effects of this proposal to the majority of Coombes Road businesses and residents, is being ignored. The application was approved once agreement had been reached that NMF and LC would work together on the proposals for the 4th arm. See comment above.

Highways England's position on accepting just one junction on the A27 has been very well documented throughout.

As we have previously stated, our group of 13 businesses and residents of the Coombes Road are only asking for one junction. We believe that the approved 3 arm scheme/design is more beneficial to the wider community particularly the HGV's that serve the agricultural businesses of the area. We further note that HE do state that they would support one or the other scheme (3 or 4 arm designs), but not both. We, the majority, support the consented 3 arm scheme.

It will open the road to through traffic and rat running

The new link will provide a more tranquil convenient access for all user groups **and this should be welcomed**. Yet again the applicant is telling the wider community what is good for them. We are adults capable of forming our own opinion and we do not agree with this statement.The potential for rat running has previously been linked with Ikea who are no longer locating at NMF. The issues of rat running being potentially encouraged by GPSs due to the 60mph legal speed limit on Coombes Road beyond the 4th arm has been addressed above. It would apply under the existing and approved NMF arrangements ; the 4th arm however will provide some registered control over the attractiveness of the route. This would seem to be an admission by the applicant that Sussex Pad Hamlet and the 4th arm design will indeed act as a bottleneck which can only induce congestion. How the road is managed beyond that is not a matter for this application.

Impacts on the Pad including quality of life, loss of value, loss of parking, U turns being dangerous, dangerous access and egress from the properties opening onto traffic, 1 hour long closures to allow septic tank emptying,

All of these matters have been addressed in our response of 16th July 2021. Accesses will not be blocked or prevented, the pinch point will not be blocked by service vehicles which can stop outside of this speed control area. Loss of value to properties is not a planning matter but the proposals should be considered in the context of the additional screening that will be provided to the A27 trunk road, traffic volumes and management arrangements along the 4th arm and the convenient routing that the 4th arm will be provided for all residents not having to journey east first before going west. But they will have to first travel west before going east, which negates any west going benefit.

Noise levels are over guidelines, Air pollution modelling is flawed - pollution will impact on residents and the nursery

Noise, air quality and vibration have been robustly appraised. A note has been provided by LC to the SDNPA in respect of air quality impacts on the nursery. The front cover to this is attached here below.

Lancing College has robustly appraised all options for the 4th arm with the nursery and its neighbours in mind. They would not be party to a programme that is harmful Yet this is exactly what the applicant is doing with the wider business community.. No statutory consultees have objected on these grounds

Allow a private road only for Lancing College on College Land

This has been addressed. A new private drive across the LC estate would be more harmful to the landscape, ecology, soils and setting of the estate's heritage assets. All options have been considered As previously stated, a “new private drive” is not required as the applicant already has a dedicated access road, directly from the A27, leading to the College. With minimal work this would provide

adequate access for their individual business while still leaving the 3 arm consented scheme available for the majority. The proposed scheme is the least harmful and can be fully mitigated and linked with a package of additional significant enhancements and benefits. It depends in what context? We believe that the majority of businesses and residents will be more harmed by the 4th arm scheme as opposed to the 3 arm scheme. Therefore we would disagree with this statement.

Members' Debate

The road needs to be wide enough for vehicles to pass and keeping Coombes Road open will spare the 'hamlet' properties from passing HGVs.

Again - vehicles will have full access and will be able to pass. The pinch point will not prevent the free flowing of vehicles. HGVs will be set back from the properties and noise, air quality and vibration assessments have all show that such impactswill be negligible..We are under the impression that the design includes north bound traffic prioritization. Therefore southbound vehicles, including HGVs will not be "free flowing" as the applicant suggests.

It will cause more harm than benefits - the impacts of the longer approved route will be annoying and awkward but will not be as bad for LC as suggested.

Lancing College's board of Trustees are responsible for protecting the College's assets and operations, But unfortunately this proposed 4th arm will affect more than just LC, so decisions should not be made due to the responsibilities of the College's trustees or indeed to protect one individual, private business. which includes their ongoing environmental and public benefits packages. These responsibilities and the connections between them and the role of the SDNPA are set out in Lancing College's application Statement. The College did not want to use its funds to defend its long established access upon which it and multiple users of the estate depend. The 4th arm is needed not to provide an improvement to its access but to replace what is being lost as a result of the currently approved NMF plans This statement is at the very heart of the problem. LC have decided that the 3 arm consented scheme will/may dissuade a few customers (presumably only those who live west of the Coombes Road), but that the 4th arm scheme will appease these same people. We find this conclusion illogical as their proposed scheme will still induce extra travel millage and time for all their customers wishing to arrive from the east or leave to travel to the east. We do not think that their rationale for the proposed scheme has been well thought out. . The impacts of the approved routing are fully documented. They do not translate to something that is awkward or inconvenient but to significant cumulative additional journey miles, time, costs and emissions and to the actual and perceived attractiveness of the College with clear financial implications that will impact on how the College supports other community groups and public sector bodies that include Adur Council and the SDNPA. The 4th arm will better facilitate access to the SDNPA within a more desirable tranquil approach for all user groups and in a location and way that is convenient for the wider community. Yet again the applicant is telling the wider community what is good for them. We are adults capable of forming

our own opinion and we do not agree with this statement.

The route is not the right solution - due to the loss of trees, increased traffic, impact on horse riders
These matters have been responded to above.

A number of drainage matters are not known - as tittle disruption as possible here is required.
The statutory consultees have agreed the proposals and these matters can be appropriately address by conditions.

Rat-Running should be considered further in relation to a possible change to a 30mph speed limit for the stretch of Coombes Road, albeit opening up access is a condition of the National Park
The issue of the speed limits further along Coombes Road being outside of the application area is outlined above. Acknowledgement of the benefits of improved access to the National Park is welcomed.

From: Milling M [redacted]
Sent: 21 July 202112:38
To: 'Jane Rarok' Marie Nagy [redacted]
Subject: FW: Your diffusion tube results - Lancing College

Dear Jane

Re air quality in the garden we did a UNICEF test back in spring 2019 which returned results in the low end of normal for NO2 levels recommended by UNICEF and WHO which we were pleased with . I compared our results with 16 other nurseries owned by our contact, Cheryl Hadland, and we were bang on average - see row 30 vs 26 on attached spreadsheet (which I have anonymised regarding the addresses of Cheryl's nurseries).

Since then we have done more planting and erected fences around the children play area so things should be going in the right direction. Also the roundabout is further away (and screened by many more trees) than the existing traffic lights so there will be less stopping and starting outside the Pad which will help further.

Air quality inside will be even better since the nursery is climate controlled using an air handling unit. It is also double glazed and sound proofed.

The move of cars to electric should help again with air quality and with sound levels. The planting on the new strip between the 4th arm and the A27 will also help.

Best

Mark

Mark Milling CA
Bursar | Lancing College, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 0RW
[redacted]