
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 30 January 2024 20:18
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/23/0406
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 30/01/2024 8:19 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The West of Ashington C of E School Park Lane Ashington West Sussex
Proposal:	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 180 dwellings, all-weather sport pitch, sports pavilion and allotments; with associated access, landscaping, open space and infrastructure.
Case Officer:	Nicola Pettifer

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	14 Covert Mead Ashington Pulborough
----------	-------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking
Comments:	It is stated on the website related to the proposed development: "This suggests the proposed development could attract less than 100 vehicles within the morning and evening peak hours." "...could attract..."? What is the range of vehicles identified? It seems that the minimum end of a measurement may have taken when (all things considered) the higher end would be more representative of vehicle use. Even if 100 vehicles is a realistic figure, congestion over a short period of time would be significant. "Since COVID-19 there has been a rise in the number of employees being offered

flexible/home working contracts."

Whilst current data may suggest this is the case, using this to indicate future trends is extremely unwise. Time will change the attitude of industry and individuals to working idealisms so who knows what that will bring? Using a recent global event to justify a snapshot baseline figure is shortsighted and ill thought out.

"This combined with the location of the site in relation to active travel modes and local amenities, means that the number of vehicular trips associated with the proposed development is likely to be lower than this figure."

Local amenities have their place but will not make any difference to vehicle use, which I would have thought any credible data would show. As for residents' use of other travel modes: the village is not serviced by any rail connections, other than those where a vehicle journey is required and suggesting a bus service with an hourly frequency and a latest departure time from Horsham of 18:12 (M-F) is anything but a token mode of public transport is ridiculous at best. To suggest "active travel modes and local amenities" will dictate a lower number of vehicular trips, compared to those identified, is fundamentally wrong.

"The vast majority of these vehicle trips will travel along Church Lane to the London Road junction where they will split north and south."

I am not sure I understand the relevance of this sentence. The pinch-point will clearly be from within the proposed development to the London Road. The misjudged number of cars requiring access together with weak assumptions will cause future congestion and increased road safety risks. I would be interested to know when West Sussex County Council Highways conducted their Road Safety Audit as I'm unsure whether consideration has been made for busy periods of traffic and pedestrian movements, such as when the school or church are in operation, as surely the busiest times should be a significant consideration in any analysis?

Kind regards