

We live at #1 the Daisycroft and probably have the best view of the access to the proposed site. (see attachment A).

Whilst we don't pretend to have the qualifications that [REDACTED] has, we suggest that having lived here, our analysis of the site is probably just as, if not more relevant.

[REDACTED] states that his analysis is both robust as well as a worst-case scenario! In summary. We suggest that this analysis is highly questionable as it contains errors, makes assumptions that don't stand up to scrutiny. Further, as far as we can see, he makes no allowances to the volume of traffic emanating from the 9 new houses, plus he has chosen to avoid making any suggestion to manage the traffic, rights of way etc.

1. Public Right of Way (Footpath 2547) – contrary to the plans, as the north pavement is narrow and non-existent as it approaches the proposed access to the new site, walkers do tend to use the wider south pavement. Clearly by law, pedestrians have priority at the access to the new site. Due to the layout, vehicles leaving the new site will have minimal sight of pedestrians travelling to the east, probably only a metre or so. It is therefore imperative that plans be upgraded to include a traffic management scheme so that vehicles leaving the site are slowed to a halt, or walking pace.
2. Access Street PLAN A3 1 – 100: this plan incorrectly assumes that the layby outside Nos 17/18 The Daisycroft may be used when opposing traffic meets in this single-track road. This is incorrect, it is owned by the residents of the Daisycroft, is used for visitor parking for the residents of 15-20 & No 1 (see attachment A). There is no right for the current or future owners of the site/properties to determine how this is used; access plans should make it clear whether vehicles arriving/leaving has the right of way across the narrow stretch of The Daisycroft.
3. We note that in many of the street plans, they show vehicles exiting the new access in the middle of the new road, surely according to the "Manual for Streets" this is incorrect? Just standing at the new access where a driver would be sitting behind the wheel, he/she would NOT have the visibility shown in the visibility splays - see attachment B.
4. Access for Little Orchard & Nos 16/17/18 The Daisycroft – the driveways for these homes all back onto the narrow road, with #16 particularly vulnerable with its proximity to the new access. We suggest that the plans show #16's access incorrectly. Vehicles reversing from #16 will have minimal vision of the traffic exiting from the new site.
5. For completeness, it is probably helpful to put this in the context of existing traffic management issues within The Daisycroft estate. Currently traffic calming measures are installed via a speed hump outside #1. The design is aimed to reduce speed to 10mph, however realistically speeds of 17mph are not unusual; however, we have noticed, usually drivers unfamiliar with the layout, travelling at faster speeds into the approach to the club. Nevertheless, [REDACTED] should have also considered the impact of traffic over the whole Daisycroft estate, eg traffic flows to/from nos 2-15 vs increased traffic to/from the new estate.
6. It should also be a concern that much of Furner's Mead is single lane, as it is used by many non-residents for parking whilst working locally; during construction, it is unlikely that heavy vehicles will be able to pass one another; Daisycroft further is not built for such traffic, will the developers make good at their cost damage caused?
7. For safety reasons, this is why the planners such as [REDACTED] should take a more pragmatic approach to managing safety for the access to/from this new estate. In [REDACTED] analysis, it mostly addresses the volume/frequency of traffic to/from the bowls club & allotments, it was not immediately apparent whether the traffic volumes emanating from the new development were included? As the development has gone against the that proposed/agreed within the Henfield Neighbourhood plan, one has to assume there will be more cars, associated traffic, couriers, service vehicles, as well as construction vehicles. With the cost of properties these days, we should expect that both partners will need to work, there is little local employment which in turn implies more traffic affecting the local infrastructure, not only The Daisycroft, but also the whole Furner's Mead estate, and the exit onto the A281.
8. It appears strange that the developers have made no attempt to meet with anyone (eg Residents Association) to find ways of better working together.

Conclusion: With the apparent unwillingness to take on board the seriousness of the potential risks, we recommend refusal of the plans as revised. The amendments recently posted frankly have no benefit whatsoever, issues mentioned previously re flooding, flat roof ridges, proximity if nos 8/9 to the back of the houses in Henfield Common North, the agreed Neighbourhood plan for 10 single story retirement homes. etc

Attachment A



Attachment B

