From: Marie Nagy [redacted]
Sent: 16 July 2021 08:45
[redacted]
Subject: FW: Adur 4th Arm - responses to residents and CPRE objections

Dear Tim, Jane and James

We note the attached representations have been submitted by residents of Coombe Road and the CPRE in objection to the 4th arm application (attachments 1 and 2). We respond to these as follows.

Residents of Coombes Road

Lancing College met with residents who live adjacent to Coombes Road west and The Drive (the Pad) on 14th May, followed by a site meeting with one of that group on 21st May. A number of matters were raised which LC responded to. That group subsequently wrote to you setting out their concerns and we responded in tum to you on 17th June.

The College met separately with residents who live further north on Coombes Road on 11th November 2020 and then again on 1st July 2021. A summary note on the transport data was provided to them and a further meeting was offered to explain it. The group however declined the offer of a further meeting and instead wrote to you on 9th July. The concerns they raise relate to traffic data which is not backed up by the experts at Inspire, Vectos, Highways England or WSCC. The detail and data we used in our response dated the 9th July 2021 came directly from the traffic report provided by the applicant.

Please note that at the meetings with the Coombes Road north residents that Lancing College arranged, only the Flakes and Bill Brock (plus one other at the first meeting) were present. Bill Brock seems to lead this representation and has clearly gathered some additional signatures, even though we have not had an opportunity to discuss matters with the wider group directly. Due to COVID, our group decided to field 3 chosen representatives only, so as to limit contact. We perceived this to be a responsible action. One of Mr Brock's concerns is that Lancing could have gathered the residents to help object to the original NMF planning application. Mark Milling has reminded Mr Brock that he himself had delivered a letter to each property and business on Coombes Road in April 2018 offering contact details to get in touch to help the local response to the NMF plans (see attached). LC only received one reply to that letter drop which was not from a signatory to the objection letter that is now with you. We have heard this from the applicant but none of the 13 businesses nor residents of our group recall any such letter.The silence from Coombes Road residents was deafening at that time, so no follow up meeting was called. Please note that the College was not asking for financial help from the residents in 2018 despite this rumour going around. It was at that stage, when the NMF and airport applications were being considered that residents should have lobbied to help protect our access and the routing arrangements on the A27 ('our' being residents and LC' s). They did not. The applicant is again assuming that our group members agreed with their view of what is appropriate for the wider community. We do not, and the reason no contact was made at this early stage was that we were all content with the proposed, debated and agreed 3 arm scheme. We are now in a position of having to mitigate the effects of the approved arrangements, but from a starting position that this must tag onto what has already been agreed in respect of the new roundabout and the number of junctions that will be accepted on the A27 by Highways England.

Again our group opinion is that the proposed, debated and agreed 3 arm scheme, will be better for the wider business community and in particular for HGV agricultural traffic, than the 4th arm proposal.

The residents' objection letter against the 4th arm plans is also based on a number of critical misunderstandings and misinterpretations which we could have helped resolve had they been willing to meet with us again. Throughout the limited dialogue with regard to this proposal, LC has been dismissive, arrogant and self-serving, stating clearly that the reason they had not involved the wider community in the proposal discussion was due to LC (Bursar) "knowing what is best for all concerned"! Our group felt that with this attitude, there was very little point in a discussion about their report as we already had the written document.

Traffic Capacity Analysis

The residents' letter wrongly assumes that only "rule of thumb" calculations in respect of the traffic capacity of the proposed new 4 arm roundabout have been carried out. At no point have we said that "only" rule-of thumb was used. We correctly stated that the applicant report uses the "*very complex rule-of-thumb calculation process*" This was utilised purely to demonstrate to residents in layman's terms, as requested by Mark Milling, that minimal queuing on the 4th arm would be expected. The Inspire Transport response clearly sets out that full traffic capacity analysis (using computerised software) has already been provided to HE and has been accepted, such that HE has approved the current approvedlayout. The same approved model for the NMF proposal was utilised and adapted to add the 4th arm. The cycle time at the new junction is provided at 60 seconds to ensure that the roundabout circulatory area is kept free of significant queuing and this is standard practice at such junctions. The analysis of the overall capacity at the two junctions is more complex than simply comparing cycle times to estimate congestion levels and has been assessed in full as set out above. The junctions that are being compared are entirely different, with different layouts and pedestrian crossing phases, and will have entirely different capacity optimisation requirements which will have been taken into account within the computerised analysis. The modelling shows no material queuing or delays on the Fourth Arm and the findings of this exercise has been approved by HE.

Coombes Road access to A27

The traffic flow data for both the NMF approved layout (3 arm) and the proposed 4th arm layout (now approved by HE) was provided with the Inspire Transport response and was clear. The morning peak hour two-way flow (into and out of) the 4th arm is expected to be approximately 285 vehicles per hour. The entry flow from the 4th arm into the roundabout (only the vehicles heading towards the roundabout) is expected to be 121 vehicles for the same period. The latter figure is used for capacity analysis and vehicles exiting the junction always have the principle of free flow exits and do not affect any capacity calculations. The residents letter wrongly assumes that only 60 vehicles would be able to enter the roundabout from the 4th arm per hour at peak times. The Inspire Transport response is clear that in excess of 121 vehicles per hour would be able to enter the roundabout with vehicles entering during upstream traffic signal changes, other natural gaps in traffic and when upstream pedestrian crossing phases are called. The same applicant's traffic report states that only 2 vehicles are likely to be able to exit from the slip road onto the roundabout per signal cycle. It further states that the signal cycle will be every 60 seconds. Therefore at best there will only be 60 opportunities for 2 vehicles at a time to exit from Coombes Road onto the A27 per hour. This being the case, simple maths concludes that the 121 vehicles expected per hour, with only 60 x 2 vehicles per cycle able to exit per hour, the 121 vehicles will take over 1 hours to exit! And as the slip road can only accommodate 21 vehicles, it simply will not cope. It is also worth remembering that this same applicant's traffic report states that the "*assessments do not take into account the peak demands that can occur at school drop off and pick up times*"

Queuing

Mr Brock points out a perceived risk from traffic queuing back from the 'pinch point' to the roundabout causing delays on the A27. This is simply not a risk. Can the applicant guarantee this, as demanded by HE and the Fire & Safety Services? Again, the above maths derived from the applicant's own traffic report does not lead to this conclusion. As stated previously, a mean maximum queue of only 2 vehicles in the morning peak period is expected on the 4th arm and peak queuing would be reduced from existing levels to ensure ease of access to/from Coombes Road. We must not be beguiled by cleverly worded statements. The traffic report is clear in stating that the "*assessments do not take into account the peak demands that can occur at school drop off and pick up times*". Therefore how relevant is the use of the "mean maximum queuing" figure in this statement. The fact remains that the report identifies that 121 vehicles use the Coombes road per hour and that only 2 vehicles per minute will be able to exit onto the A27. Therefore at the highly condensed traffic peaks during the drop off and pick up times, it is highly likely that queuing will occur. Even if queuing was greater than the above for very short periods at school pick up and drop off times, the queue would quickly disperse and would be much shorter than the available queuing distance of 21 standard car lengths. The data provided by the applicant's traffic report does not support this statement. The traffic report identifies that 1 hour queues may occur within the SDNP area. Again, HE has accepted the capacity and queuing analysis provided, sufficiently to approve the layout.

CPRE

The College met with representatives of the CPRE on two occasions, 25th March and 26th April 2020. Since those meetings the 4th arm plans have been amended to follow the advice of the SDNPA and its guidance on road design within the Park and significant extra land enhancement to be provided by the College. The CPRE has not contacted the College further about the amended plans but have written to you directly .

The CPRE refer to the option of a private drive being provided for the College whilst retaining a separate through road for traffic on Coombes Road. They take this to be (1) an option in highways terms and (2) being less harmful in some way to the National Park and the setting of the College estate. Their suggestion would require a 4th arm to be added to the new A27 roundabout and the existing Coombes Road / A27 junction being kept open. Highways England has been clear and consistent throughout the consideration of plans for the A27 here that this is not an option. We cannot change their position on this. It is now clearly documented on the public record in response to the 4th arm application specifically.

If the CPRE's suggested option was available in highways terms, the assertion that it would be less environmentally harmful compared with the application scheme simply does not make sense. A private drive for Lancing College's use only would require a new carriageway to link off the 4th arm and across the steep embankment and north field, whilst retaining the existing Coombes Road junction and access to the Pad properties. This is a variation on one of the options already considered and set out in the application Design and Access Statement. It is shown to be very harmful in landscape and visual impact terms and it would sever existing habitat corridors around and across the north field set back from the A27/4th arm alignment. The option of building the 4th arm to connect further east to link with the existing Coombes Road junction has been appraised in the submission DAS and is also shown to be more harmful in environmental terms as a result of the increased in tarmac carriageway and does not correspond with existing topog raphy.

In contrast and as set out in the application plans and assessment documents , the proposed arrangement uses the existing, long established and historic route of the carriageway next to the Pad properties. It will introduce new carriageway along the base of the embankment but it

will be largely screened and not visible from short, medium or long range views. The existing Coombes Road junction will be closed and partly screened by new planting that will contribute to an enhancement habitat corridor. Lancing College has also now agreed to transfer the north field set back from the road, from crop production to species rich grassland, which will also provide a new habitat for reptiles and other fauna. This will provide a further significant visual and ecological enhancement within the National Park and the setting of the historic campus buildings of the estate. An updated biodiversity net gain assessment (BNG) will follow that includes the existing agreed mitigation and enhancement plans that will provide over 20% BNG benefit and additionally the inclusion of the new proposals for the north field, which itself will generate a very substantial BNG.

The new road plans have been amended following guidance from the National Park and drawing on the Park's design guide for new roads. This includes removing street furniture and vertical speed controls in favour of subtle but still effective speed control measures. The arrangement around the Pad buildings will not block traffic movements. It will slow vehicle speeds and provide a separation from the buildings.

The plans have been designed taking into full consideration of the needs of the College which include the need to protect the setting of it historic estate, as well as the access and linked operations of the College which fund the management of the estate and its contributions to the National Park, as well as wider public access to the College's facilities, jobs and local supply chains. The College has made it abundantly clear that they perceive this plan to suit **their** business but we wish to point out that there are at least 13 other businesses relient upon the Coombes Road. That is 13 businesses contributing to the National Park. 13 businesses providing jobs. 13 businesses providing work for their supply chains and 13 businesses that do not share the view of the College that this plan will suit the needs of farm and HGV vehicles required to run these businesses. The CPRE's continued failure to appreciate this and to continue to purport to have a better understanding of the issues that affect the Lancing College and the management of its estate is deeply frustrating. During this entire process, the College has openly stated that the reason they have unilaterally forged ahead with this plan, is as they know best what the community needs, so to make this statement is farcical in the opinion of the Coombes Road Business and Residents Group.

Additional, largely low volume traffic will pass by the Pad properties. The road design and linked, noise, vibration, landscape, visual impact, habitat and BNG assessments however clearly set out the benefits of the application scheme and how the existing properties at the Pad (the Little Lancing nursery and residential properties) will not be harmed. The College have been extremely mindful of these needs taking into account the need to protect the nursery but also their neighbours.

We trust that this response is helpful. We will be happy to provide further clarification if necessary.

Kind Regards,

Marie Nagy
Director
Teal Planning Ltd
[redacted]
Brentano Suite, Solar House, 915 High Road, North Finchley, London, Nl2 8QJ