

From: **Charlie Aitkin**

Date: Tue, 18 Aug 2026 at 11:26

Subject: AWDM/0628/26 — Objection — Charlie Aitkin, 7 Neptune Road, Goring, Worthing BN12 4FU

To: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

This message was sent from outside Adur & Worthing Councils

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#)

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to register an objection to planning application AWDM/0628/26, Land Between Sword Street and Martlets Way, Worthing (Land at Durrington Gasworks), for a mixed-use development comprising 123 dwellings and commercial floorspace.

My objection is set out in full below. I attempted to submit it via Public Access but received a 403 error on submission on 18 August 2026.

Application Reference: AWDM/0628/26

Address: Land Between Sword Street And Martlets Way Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: Full planning application for a mixed-use development comprising 123 dwellings and commercial floorspace together with associated parking, landscaping, open space and drainage [Land at Durrington Gasworks]

Case Officer: Giles Holbrook

Name: Charlie Aitkin

Address: 7 Neptune Road, Goring, Worthing, West Sussex BN12 4FU

Commenter type: Neighbour

Stance: Object

Reasons: Highway Access and Parking; Overdevelopment; Privacy, Light and Noise

--- START OF COMMENT ---

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION AWDM/0628/26

LAND BETWEEN SWORD STREET AND MARTLETS WAY, WORTHING, WEST SUSSEX
(LAND AT DURRINGTON GASWORKS)

Full planning application for a mixed-use development comprising 123 dwellings and commercial floorspace together with associated parking, landscaping, open space and drainage.

I object. I refer below to the existing estate at Elizabeth Square, served from Sword Street, as "Phase 1", and to this application as "Phase 2".

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION

1. Phase 2 has no vehicular access of its own. Drawing BDML-01 Revision A shows it connecting to Phase 1 at Road 9 and Road 10. Both feed the same street network and out through one junction at Sword Street. Two connections, one funnel.
2. The baseline is wrong. Phase 1 is unfinished. Two blocks of flats and a McCarthy Stone retirement development are consented but unoccupied. Their traffic is still to come, on the same route.
3. There is no resilience. If Sword Street or the eastern arm of Barrington Road is blocked, neither phase has an alternative route out.
4. Two links on the drawings are undefined. "Potential Link To Barrington Road" and "Potential Link To Juno Close" have no stated mode. If built as roads later, while Road 9 and Road 10 stay open, the estate would become a bypass of the existing Barrington Road bollards, and a rat run for drivers travelling between Goring Road and Shaftesbury Avenue who want to avoid the signalised junction on Goring Road on their way to the A27.
5. The fix is already on the applicant's own drawing. Build the Barrington Road link as Phase 2's access, or extend the western access the applicant is already providing. Reduce Road 9 and Road 10 to bollarded pedestrian and cycle links. Each phase then has its own access, no through-route is created, and the existing severance is untouched.
6. The existing bollards already fail. Where Barrington Road was severed, the connecting section is not carriageway but a tarmac-surfaced footpath and cycle route, closed to vehicles by bollards and barriers. It is not being used only by pedestrians and cyclists: delivery riders on mopeds use it nightly, and have since summer 2025, unenforced. Its smooth surface makes it easy to ride. Any new pedestrian and cycle link must be built to a higher standard than those bollards.
7. Vehicles already speed through Phase 1, several times a week, before Phase 1 is even complete. I ask for physical traffic-calming along the full length of Sword Street, secured before first occupation, whatever the outcome on access.

I am not opposed to development here, or to walking and cycling links between the phases. I am objecting to one specific design decision, and I have set out two workable alternatives.

1. ALL OF PHASE 2'S TRAFFIC WOULD BE FUNNELLED OUT THROUGH PHASE 1

Drawing BDML-01 Revision A shows the internal roads of Phase 2 meeting the existing development in two places on its eastern boundary, at Road 9 and Road 10. Both feed into the Phase 1 street network, and all traffic then leaves by the same route: Sword Street, onto the eastern arm of Barrington Road, and out to Shaftesbury Avenue.

Two connection points are not two accesses. They are two entrances to the same funnel.

The traffic of 123 dwellings and a commercial element would be added to Phase 1's traffic and discharged through a single point. That means congestion on Phase 1's internal streets, at Sword Street, and at the eastern arm of Barrington Road.

The position is worse than current traffic suggests, because Phase 1 is not finished. Two blocks of flats and a McCarthy Stone retirement development within Phase 1 are consented but not complete or occupied. Their traffic is still to come, by the same route.

The correct assessment is a fully occupied Phase 1, including the flats and the retirement development, plus all of Phase 2, plus the commercial element, leaving by one route. I ask the Council to confirm that the Transport Assessment has been prepared on that basis, and to state the date and duration of any traffic surveys relied upon. Surveys taken while Phase 1 was partly unoccupied understate the baseline.

There is no resilience in this arrangement. If Sword Street or the eastern arm of Barrington Road is blocked by a collision, breakdown, delivery vehicle, utility works, refuse collection or fire appliance, there is no alternative route out for either phase.

The burden also falls in the wrong place. The traffic consequences of Phase 2 would be borne almost entirely by existing Phase 1 residents, who gain nothing from the arrangement.

2. THE EXISTING SEVERANCE OF BARRINGTON ROAD

Barrington Road is not continuous. It exists as two arms: an eastern arm off Shaftesbury Avenue serving Phase 1, and a western arm further west, alongside the playing field of West Park CE Primary School. Between them the carriageway stops, and the connecting section is a tarmac-surfaced footpath and cycle route, closed to vehicles by bollards and barriers.

To be fair to the applicant, the scheme as drawn does not connect to the western arm for

vehicles, and so does not itself reinstate a through-route. The western link appears only as an annotation, "Potential Link To Barrington Road".

The risk is what that leaves open. If the western link were later built as a carriageway while Road 9 and Road 10 remained open to vehicles, the estate would provide a continuous route from Shaftesbury Avenue through both phases to the western arm, bypassing the bollards, without that ever having been applied for or assessed.

That through-route would be a rat run, and it is worth being explicit about why.

Goring Road runs to the south of Barrington Road and is the main route between Goring and Worthing. At its signalised junction, traffic either continues east into central Worthing or turns north towards Shaftesbury Avenue, which joins the eastern arm of Barrington Road and is the route many drivers use to reach the A27 bypass. Queues build at those signals at peak times.

A continuous vehicular route through this estate would let drivers travelling between Goring Road and Shaftesbury Avenue avoid that junction altogether, by cutting north to the western arm of Barrington Road, through the estate, and out via the eastern arm.

That is traffic heading for a trunk road, not local trips. It is heavily peaked, and the drivers making it are by definition trying to save time. They would have no origin or destination in the estate, no reason to drive considerately within it, and every incentive to get through it quickly, on residential streets with a children's play area at the Sword Street end and children walking to West Park CE Primary School.

The congestion effect would also compound rather than balance out. Any incident or delay on the signalised route would divert traffic into the estate at exactly the times its own roads are busiest, and any resulting problem within the estate would then feed back onto the surrounding network. A rat run does not relieve congestion; it moves it onto streets that were never designed to carry it.

The severance prevents traffic passing through this area for drivers with no origin or destination in it. It does not establish that a development should have only one access. Two unconnected access points create no route through, because a driver entering either half can only leave the way they came. The only difference is where the development's own traffic joins the network.

Under either option in section 3 the footpath severance stays exactly as it is and the phases are not joined for vehicles, so no through-route is created. The only arrangement that would create one is a western vehicular link combined with Road 9 and Road 10 left open.

3. THE ARRANGEMENT I ASK THE COUNCIL TO SECURE

Phase 2 needs its own vehicular access, and must not be connected to Phase 1 for general traffic. There are two ways to achieve that, and both use elements already on the applicant's drawing.

Option A, which I prefer: the "Potential Link To Barrington Road" is designed and built as Phase 2's vehicular entry point onto the western arm of Barrington Road. The footpath severance between the two arms is retained unchanged. Road 9 and Road 10 are reduced to pedestrian and cycle links, closed to vehicles by bollards or barriers.

Option B: the western access on the Martlets Way side is reworked to serve the whole of Phase 2, rather than only the apartment blocks it appears to serve on the submitted layout. Road 9 and Road 10 are again reduced to pedestrian and cycle links.

The applicant already proposes a vehicular access at the western end of the site. The principle of a western access is therefore not in dispute, and the applicant evidently considers one achievable. Only its extent and capacity are at issue. If a western access is acceptable for part of the development, I ask the Council to require the applicant to demonstrate why it could not serve all of it, and to state what would be needed to achieve that. The Local Plan records at paragraph 4.31 that current access to the allocation is from Martlets Way or Woods Way and that, with some improvement, it would be suitable for the employment development of the site.

Either option gives each phase its own access, divides traffic between two points rather than one, leaves neither phase dependent on the other, and preserves the existing severance.

The two options differ in one respect, and I should be fair about it. The western arm of Barrington Road is not solely commercial: it has residential frontage as well as business premises and the Westholme Clinic. Under Option A those residents would take additional traffic they do not have today, and I do not pretend that is costless to them. It is an adopted highway already carrying commercial movements, so a properly designed junction onto it is conventional rather than novel, and the alternative concentrates the same traffic onto Phase 1's streets and one junction, affecting more homes. If Option A proceeds, I ask that it is accompanied by traffic-calming and footway measures on the western arm, designed by West Sussex County Council, so those residents are protected.

Option B adds traffic to no existing residential frontage at all, taking Phase 2 traffic west, away from both Phase 1 and the western arm. On that basis it may be better overall, and I

ask the Council to consider it rather than treating a Barrington Road link as the only alternative to the submitted scheme.

I also ask that:

- Road 9 and Road 10 are provided as pedestrian and cycle links, built so motor vehicles physically cannot use them, to the standard in section 6;
- an emergency-only connection at one of those points would be acceptable, using collapsible bollards or similar, passable by fire and ambulance vehicles but not general traffic; and
- Phase 2 is not given both a Barrington Road access and a western vehicular access unless the combined effect has been modelled, since that combination would create a different through-route rather than remove one.

I support walking and cycling links at both Road 9 and Road 10. My objection is to a vehicular connection.

4. THE "POTENTIAL LINK" ANNOTATIONS SHOULD BE DEFINED BEFORE DETERMINATION

Drawing BDML-01 Revision A, Boundary and Dwelling Materials, by MDD Architecture and Urban Design, Planning Issue 29 April 2026, carries two annotations on the southern boundary: "Potential Link To Barrington Road" and "Potential Link To Juno Close".

A link described as potential has not been designed and its mode is not stated. It is unclear whether either is a footway, a cycle route or a carriageway. If undefined, they cannot have been modelled, and the Council cannot know what it is granting.

I ask the Council to require that:

- the status and mode of each link is defined before determination, not reserved;
- if the Barrington Road link is to be vehicular, it is designed, assessed and applied for within this application on the basis of Option A, serving Phase 2 with Road 9 and Road 10 closed to vehicles;
- any Juno Close link is limited to pedestrian and cycle use and physically constructed to exclude motor vehicles; and
- no link is left undefined on the approved drawings, so a vehicular connection cannot later be implemented without a fresh application and a fresh opportunity for residents to comment.

I do not object to a Barrington Road link. I would welcome it as Phase 2's access. I object to

an undefined link combined with vehicular connections at Road 9 and Road 10.

I request that the Transport Assessment models and compares:

- (a) Option A: Phase 2 from the western arm of Barrington Road, Road 9 and Road 10 closed to vehicles;
- (b) Option B: Phase 2 from a western access serving the whole development, Road 9 and Road 10 closed to vehicles; and
- (c) the layout as submitted, connected at both Road 9 and Road 10.

Each should be tested with and without a vehicular Juno Close link. Scenario (c), and any scenario combining a Barrington Road access with a vehicular connection at Road 9 or Road 10, should be assessed for reinstatement of a through-route between the two arms.

I ask specifically that any such assessment models the movement between Goring Road and Shaftesbury Avenue, including traffic heading for the A27, and estimates how much of it would divert through the estate to avoid the signalised junction on Goring Road.

5. VEHICLES ARE ALREADY SPEEDING ON THE ESTATE

Vehicles are already being driven at excessive speed through the existing estate. This is not isolated: it happens regularly, several times a week. I have witnessed it, and it has been raised repeatedly and independently by other residents on the estate's residents' group.

This is with Phase 1 alone, and before Phase 1 is even complete.

Adding 123 dwellings to the same internal roads, and creating a longer continuous route through the estate, would make it worse. Longer, straighter, more continuous routes encourage higher speeds, and a route serving as a through-route attracts drivers with no connection to the estate.

Irrespective of the access outcome, I ask the Council to secure physical traffic-calming along the full length of Sword Street, start to end rather than at isolated points. Speed bumps, cushions or tables at appropriate intervals, designed and approved by West Sussex County Council, secured by condition or legal agreement, with details approved before first occupation.

6. THE EXISTING BOLLARDS ARE ALREADY BEING DEFEATED

Where Barrington Road was severed, the connecting section is not carriageway. It is a footpath and cycle route, surfaced in tarmac, closed to vehicles by bollards and barriers. Those measures do not work against powered two-wheelers, and the smooth surface makes the route easy to ride.

That footpath is not being used only by pedestrians and cyclists. It is used regularly by delivery riders on mopeds and similar machines. This has happened since summer 2025, so for over a year, and it is not occasional. Movements are concentrated in the evening and into the night, typically from around 5pm until 11pm or midnight. The noise is intrusive at those hours; I have a young child whose sleep it disturbs. I am not aware of any enforcement taking place or planned.

This is directly relevant in two ways.

First, an existing physical closure on this very route, installed for exactly the purpose I am asking the Council to secure, is inadequate against powered two-wheelers. A surfaced path with bollards is not enough. Any pedestrian and cycle link at Road 9, Road 10 or Juno Close must therefore be designed to a demonstrably higher standard, with details approved by condition before construction, and demonstrated to exclude powered two-wheelers by bollard spacing, staggered barriers or route geometry.

Second, mitigation dependent on enforcement should be treated with caution. I ask the Council not to accept any measure reliant on enforcement unless the applicant can state who will enforce it, how, and with what resources.

7. SWORD STREET IS CONSTRAINED AND ADJOINS A CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA

Sword Street is not lightly used. In my experience the existing exit is already congested by traffic accessing nearby business premises and by vehicles joining the network towards Shaftesbury Avenue.

The Sword Street access adjoins a children's play area. Concentrating Phase 2's traffic here risks additional residential traffic from 123 dwellings, vehicles diverting to avoid congestion elsewhere, increased peak-time movements, and increased interaction between vehicles and children immediately adjacent to an area they use.

Policy DM5(a)(vi) requires layouts creating safe conditions for access, egress and active travel. Policy DM5(a)(viii) states development should not have an unacceptable impact on occupiers of adjacent properties, including vehicular movements resulting in severe cumulative impacts on the road network. Policy DM15 (Sustainable Transport and Active

Travel) is also relevant, as is the NPPF requirement that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users.

8. WEST PARK CE PRIMARY SCHOOL

The school's pedestrian entrances are on Clive Avenue to its west and Marlborough Road to its south. Its playing field forms the northern part of the school site and backs onto the western arm of Barrington Road, securely fenced along that boundary. The school is not entered from Barrington Road, and children do not pass between the field and that carriageway.

This matters because concentrated risk at a primary school is at the gates during arrival and departure, where many children and adults cross within a short period. A securely fenced boundary with no access point presents no equivalent interface.

I therefore do not object to a Barrington Road access on school safety grounds. It is in my view better for the school than routing Phase 2 traffic through Phase 1, since it would reach the network without using Clive Avenue or Marlborough Road at all. I ask the Council to test that against its own assessment rather than take my word for it.

I ask only that West Sussex County Council confirms footway provision and crossing points on walking routes between the development and the school entrances are adequate for the additional pedestrian movement generated. I do not consider measures along the fenced field boundary necessary.

9. OVERDEVELOPMENT AND EMPLOYMENT FLOORSPEACE

The site is allocation A10 (Martlets Way) in the Worthing Local Plan 2020-2036, adopted 28 March 2023: 4.18 hectares in Goring ward, indicative capacity 10,000 sqm employment and 28 residential units. Requirement (a) states proposals should deliver a minimum of 28 residential units and approximately 10,000 sqm employment. Paragraph 4.31 indicates the employment development is envisaged as industrial and warehousing use.

I acknowledge 28 units is a minimum and that Policy DM2 requires efficient use of land. My objection is not simply arithmetical. It is that a residential quantum more than four times the indicative capacity, on an allocation whose indicative capacity is overwhelmingly employment floorspace, is a fundamental change in the balance of uses whose consequences for access, highway capacity, safety and amenity have not been assessed.

Requirement (g) permits an element of residential development accessed from the east, via the HMRC site, but only if it facilitates delivery of employment floorspace at Martlets Way accessed from the west and provides for the former gasholder site to be brought forward. The residential element is conditional, and was contemplated as a means of unlocking employment delivery. An element of that order is a very different proposition from 123 dwellings.

I ask the Council to establish:

- the quantum of employment floorspace proposed, in sqm and by use class;
- whether it meets the approximately 10,000 sqm in A10(a), and if not, what secures the balance and when;
- whether requirement (g) is satisfied; and
- whether the layout and access comply with requirement (f), which states they should not constrain or prevent development coming forward elsewhere within the site as a whole.

If the scheme delivers substantially less employment floorspace than A10 refers to, I ask the Council to consider whether it conflicts with A10 and with Policy DM11 (Protecting and Enhancing Employment Sites). I understand the policies map was modified so the Goring Business Park employment designation includes the employment areas within allocation A10.

I also ask whether the resulting density, massing, height and layout are appropriate to the site and its surroundings under Policies DM2 and DM5.

10. CUMULATIVE HIGHWAY AND PARKING ASSESSMENT

A10 requirement (j) requires contributions towards highway safety improvements at the A259 Goring Way and Goring Street junction and capacity improvements at the A259 and A2032 Goring Crossways junction. Allocation A8 (HMRC Offices, Barrington Road), the adjoining allocation to the east, requires appropriate junction improvements at Barrington Road and Shaftesbury Avenue.

I ask that the Transport Assessment examines:

- existing traffic conditions and queueing, with the date and duration of any surveys relied upon;
- peak-period traffic, and arrival and departure periods at West Park CE Primary School;
- traffic generated by the 123 dwellings;
- traffic generated by the occupied Phase 1 dwellings;

- traffic from the consented but unbuilt development within Phase 1, namely the two blocks of flats and the McCarthy Stone retirement development. I ask the Council to confirm the consented unit numbers and require their trip generation in full. Retirement and extra-care accommodation generates care worker shift movements, visitor trips, deliveries and patient transport which standard residential trip rates do not always capture, and these should be assessed specifically;
- employment and commercial traffic, including existing business traffic on both arms of Barrington Road and existing residential traffic on the western arm;
- construction traffic and its route;
- vehicle speeds within the estate;
- pedestrian and cycle movements;
- emergency and refuse vehicle access, and the consequences of any single access being blocked;
- the A259 Goring Way and Goring Street junction;
- the A259 and A2032 Goring Crossways junction;
- Barrington Road and Shaftesbury Avenue;
- the signalised junction on Goring Road, and the volume of traffic turning north towards Shaftesbury Avenue and the A27;
- the potential for that movement to divert through the estate if a continuous route exists;
- Sword Street, both arms of Barrington Road, and Martlets Way; and
- the three access scenarios in section 4.

I also ask whether on-site parking is sufficient for 123 dwellings plus the commercial element, and whether any shortfall would displace parking onto Sword Street and surrounding streets, or into the adjoining business park, further narrowing the access route.

11. PRIVACY, LIGHT AND NOISE

Policy DM5(a)(viii) requires that development should not have an unacceptable impact on occupiers of adjacent properties, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight or outlook, or an unacceptable increase in noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts.

I ask the Council to assess overlooking and loss of privacy, having regard to height, massing, window positions and separation distances; daylight and sunlight impacts on existing properties and gardens; noise and disturbance from access arrangements, servicing, refuse and delivery movements, and from the commercial element including hours of operation and external plant; external and street lighting; and the cumulative effect of these alongside the traffic impacts above.

On noise, the baseline must be correct. As set out in section 6, the severed section of

Barrington Road already carries powered two-wheeler movements through the evening and into the night, typically 5pm until 11pm or midnight, and has since summer 2025. Any noise assessment should reflect that existing evening and night-time environment rather than an assumed quiet residential baseline, and assess what the proposal would add. Evening and night-time impacts should be considered specifically, not only weekday peak-hour traffic.

Given the employment component is envisaged as industrial and warehousing use, I also ask the Council to be satisfied that the relationship between the residential and employment elements is acceptable in both directions, with adequate screening and separation. A10 identifies as a site constraint that the close proximity of residential development may affect any employment layout, with a need for adequate screening.

12. QUESTIONS I ASK TO BE ANSWERED IN THE OFFICER'S REPORT

So that the position is on the record, I ask that the officer's report addresses each of the following:

Q1. Does Phase 2 have any vehicular access onto the wider road network other than through Phase 1? If not, why not?

Q2. What is West Sussex County Council's standard for the maximum number of dwellings served by a single point of vehicular access, and would a fully occupied Phase 1 plus Phase 2 exceed it?

Q3. On what date, and over what period, were the traffic surveys relied upon carried out, and what proportion of Phase 1 was occupied at that time?

Q4. Have the consented but unbuilt flats and McCarthy Stone retirement development within Phase 1 been included in the trip generation? What unit numbers and trip rates were used?

Q5. What mode is each "Potential Link" on drawing BDML-01 Revision A intended to be, and has each been modelled?

Q6. What quantum of employment floorspace does the application provide, in sqm and by use class, and how does that compare with the approximately 10,000 sqm in A10(a)?

Q7. Why can the western access already proposed for the apartment blocks not be designed to serve the whole of Phase 2?

Q8. What would happen to access for both phases if Sword Street or the eastern arm of Barrington Road were blocked?

Q9. What physical specification is proposed for any pedestrian and cycle link, and how will it exclude powered two-wheelers given that the existing bollards on this road do not?

Q10. Has the option of Phase 2 having its own access, with Road 9 and Road 10 closed to vehicles, been assessed and compared against the submitted layout? If not, why not?

Q11. Has any assessment been made of how much traffic travelling between Goring Road

and Shaftesbury Avenue, including traffic heading for the A27, would divert through the estate to avoid the signalised junction on Goring Road if a continuous route were available?

13. WHAT I ASK THE COUNCIL TO DO NOW

How Phase 2 is accessed is the single most important issue raised by this application. It determines the traffic, safety and amenity consequences for every existing resident of Phase 1, and once the estate is built it cannot be revisited. A condition cannot retrofit an access that was never designed.

What I am asking for is a change of layout, not the loss of the development. The housing, the commercial floorspace and the number of units can all remain exactly as proposed. What changes is where Phase 2's traffic joins the road network, and that change uses a connection the applicant has already drawn.

I therefore ask the Council, before determination, to require the applicant to submit an amended access arrangement on the basis of Option A or Option B, together with a Transport Assessment that compares it against the submitted layout. That is a proportionate request at this stage and a straightforward one for the applicant to meet.

If the Council is not minded to require that, I ask that the officer's report states expressly why an independent access for Phase 2 was not pursued, and answers the questions in section 12, so that residents can see what was considered and on what evidence.

CONCLUSION

I object to application AWDM/0628/26 in its current form.

The outcome I ask the Council to secure is:

- Phase 1 - Sword Street, onto the eastern arm of Barrington Road and Shaftesbury Avenue
- Phase 2 - the "Potential Link To Barrington Road" built as its access (Option A), or a western access on the Martlets Way side serving the whole development (Option B)
- Road 9 and Road 10 - pedestrian and cycle links only, physically closed to general traffic and to powered two-wheelers, with a controlled emergency-vehicle connection if required

rather than all of Phase 2's traffic being funnelled through Road 9 and Road 10 into Phase 1 and out via Sword Street.

I request that any permission is conditional upon:

1. No general vehicular connection between Phase 2 and the existing estate at Road 9, Road 10 or any other point, so the existing severance of Barrington Road is preserved;
2. Phase 2 being served by its own vehicular access, either the "Potential Link To Barrington Road" built as a carriageway or a western access serving the whole development, designed and assessed as part of this application;
3. Both "Potential Link" annotations on drawing BDML-01 Revision A being defined before determination rather than reserved, with any Juno Close link limited to pedestrian and cycle use;
4. Phase 2 not being given both a Barrington Road access and a western vehicular access unless the combined effect has been assessed and found acceptable;
5. Any pedestrian and cycle connection at Road 9, Road 10 or Juno Close being physically incapable of carrying motor vehicles including powered two-wheelers, to a demonstrably higher standard than the existing bollards on the severed section of Barrington Road, with details approved before construction. Signage or designation alone should not be relied upon;
6. Any emergency-vehicle connection at Road 9 or Road 10 being designed so it cannot be used by general traffic;
7. Physical traffic-calming, such as speed bumps, cushions or tables at appropriate intervals, along the full length of Sword Street, designed and approved by West Sussex County Council, secured before first occupation;
8. Delivery of the employment floorspace referred to in A10, secured by condition or legal agreement, with phasing tied to residential delivery;
9. Demonstration that the layout and access do not constrain development elsewhere within the allocation and provide for the former gasholder site to be brought forward, per A10(f) and A10(g);
10. A cumulative highway assessment covering the matters in section 10, including both arms of Barrington Road and the consequences of any single access being blocked;
11. That assessment being based on a fully occupied Phase 1, including the consented but unbuilt flats and McCarthy Stone retirement development;
12. Confirmation from West Sussex County Council that footway provision and crossing points on walking routes to West Park CE Primary School are adequate;
13. If Option A proceeds, traffic-calming and footway measures on the western arm of Barrington Road, designed by West Sussex County Council, to protect the existing residential frontage there;
14. Full assessment of privacy, daylight, sunlight, noise and lighting impacts on existing homes, using a correct evening and night-time noise baseline; and
15. Appropriate enforceable highway measures secured before the development is occupied.

If the applicant cannot demonstrate that Phase 2 can be served by its own vehicular access rather than funnelled out through Phase 1, and that the development can operate without unacceptable cumulative highway impacts or unacceptable harm to the amenity of existing residents, I ask the Council to refuse planning permission.

PROCEDURAL REQUESTS

1. I ask that this application be determined by the Planning Committee rather than under delegated powers, given the scale of the development, the number of existing residents affected, and the fact that the access arrangement cannot be revisited once built.
2. I ask to be notified of the committee date and to be given the opportunity to speak.
3. I ask to be notified if amended plans, an amended access arrangement or a revised Transport Assessment are submitted, and to be given the opportunity to comment on them.
4. I ask to be notified of the decision and, if permission is granted, of the conditions imposed.

--- END OF COMMENT ---

I have also attached the comment as a text file.

Please confirm receipt and that this has been registered against the application.

Best regards,

Charlie Aitkin

This e-mail message may contain confidential or legally privileged information and is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying or the taking of any action in reliance on the information herein is prohibited. E-mails are not secure and cannot be guaranteed to be error free as they can be intercepted, amended, or contain viruses. Anyone who communicates with me by e-mail is deemed to have accepted these risks. Charlie Aitkin is not responsible for errors or omissions in this message and denies any responsibility for any damage arising from the use of e-mail. Any opinion and other statement contained in this message and any attachment are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the company.