How to contact us

Write to: Manor House, Church Street,
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5EW
Email: ltc@littlehampton-tc.gov.uk
Call: 01903 732063
Find us online: www.littlehampton-tc.gov.uk
Town Clerk – Laura Chrysostomou

27 October 2026

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the:

Planning and Transportation Committee

Venue: The New Millennium Chamber, The Manor House, Church Street, Littlehampton BN17 5EW

Date: Monday 2 November 2026

Time: 6.30 pm

Committee:
Councillor Wiltshire - Chair
Councillor Lee - Vice Chair
Councillor Daws
Councillor Long
Councillor Tandy
Councillor Woodman

Laura Chrysostomou, Town Clerk
Agenda 2026 to 2027

1. Evacuation Procedures

2. Filming of Council Meetings, Use of Social Media and Mobile Phones.

During this meeting, the public are allowed to film the Committee and officers only from the front of the public gallery, providing it does not disrupt the meeting. Any items in the Exempt Part of an agenda cannot be filmed. If another member of the public objects to being recorded, the person or persons filming must stop doing so until that member of the public has finished speaking. The use of social media is permitted but all members of the public are requested to switch their mobile devices to silent for the duration of the meeting.

3. Apologies

4. Declaration of Interest

Members and Officers are reminded to make any declaration of disclosable pecuniary or personal and/or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on this Agenda.

You should declare your interest by stating:

a. the item you have the interest in

b. whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest, whereupon you will be taking no part in the discussions on that matter, or

c. i. Whether it is a personal interest and the nature of the interest

ii. Whether it is also a prejudicial interest

iii. If it is a prejudicial interest, whether you will be exercising your right to speak under Public Forum.

It is recorded in the register of interests that:

- Councillor Wiltshire, Long, Tandy, and Woodman are Members of Arun District Council.
- Councillor Woodman is a Member of Arun District Council's Planning Committee

These interests only need to be declared at the meeting if there is an agenda item to which they relate.

5. Minutes

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2026, circulated herewith, pages 4 to 9. In accordance with the Town Council's Standing Orders, Section 9a, Members are reminded that no discussion of the draft minutes of a preceding meeting shall take place except in relation to their accuracy.

6. Chair's Report and Urgent Items

7. Public Forum

Members of the public are invited to ask questions or raise issues which are relevant and are the concern of this committee. A period of 15 minutes is allocated for this purpose. If possible, notice of intention to address the Committee should be given to the Clerk by noon of the day of the meeting.

8. Officer's Report

8.1 Planning and Other Arun District Council Matters

8.1.1 Planning Applications, Lists 41, 42, 43, and 44 if available

To consider the attached, pages 10 to 11.

8.2 Scheme of Delegation Changes – New Referral Protocol

Updates summarised to note on pages 12 to 13.

8.3 Off-Street Parking Strategy 2027 to 2030 – Consultation

To note the consultation response on page 14.

9. Rampion 2 Windfarm

10. West Sussex County Council and Other Highways Matters

10.1 Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) – Proposal for Terminus Place to be One Way, Going North

To consider whether to support the proposed Traffic Regulation Order, attached on pages 15 to 24.

11. Masterplan – North Littlehampton

12. Exempt Business

It is **Recommended** that:

The public and accredited representatives of the press be excluded from the Meeting under Section 100 Local Government Act 1972 due to the confidential nature of the business to be conducted.

How to contact us:
Write to: Manor House, Church Street,
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5EW
Email: ltc@littlehampton-tc.gov.uk
Call: 01903 732063
Find us online: www.littlehampton-tc.gov.uk
Town Clerk – Laura Chrysostomou

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee held in The New Millennium Chamber, Manor House, Church Street, Littlehampton BN17 5EW on Monday 5 October 2026 at 6.30pm.

Present:
Councillor Wiltshire – Chair
Councillor Daws
Councillor Long
Councillor Tandy
Councillor Woodman
Councillor O'Neill

In attendance:
Emily Sapsed – Democratic and Corporate Services Officer

2026 to 2027

34. Evacuation Procedures

The evacuation procedures were noted.

35. Filming of Council Meetings, Use of Social Media, and Mobile Phones.

The procedures were noted.

36. Apologies

There were apologies from Councillor Lee, Councillor O'Neill attended as their substitute.

37. Declarations of Interest

Members and Officers were reminded to make any declarations of disclosable pecuniary or personal and/or prejudicial interests that they might have in relation to items on the agenda. The standing declarations were noted and Councillor O'Neill declared an personal interest across the agenda as a member of Arun District Council.

38. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held 10 August 2026, previously circulated, were confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

39. Chair's Report and Urgent Items

39.1. Following the agenda's publication, officers were notified of a consultation on Arun District Council's On-Street Parking Strategy 2027 to 2030. This was circulated to members of the committee requesting comments, it was suggested that the request be shared with all councillors. Allowing comments to form a response to the consultation to be agreed under delegated authority to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair.

40. Public Forum

40.1. There were no members of the public present.

40.2. River ward councillors were informed by a resident of a proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which had been shared amongst local residents. Further information about this would be sought so the item could be considered at a future meeting.

41. Officer's Reports

41.1. Planning and Other Arun District Council Matters

41.1.1. Planning Applications, Lists 37, 38, 39 and 40 if available

It was resolved that:

The representations of the council, attached to these minutes as Appendix 1, be forwarded to Arun District Council.

41.2. Delegated Responses

It was resolved that:

The list of responses, previously circulated, managed under delegated authority to the Town Clerk be noted.

42. Rampion 2 Windfarm

There were none.

43. West Sussex County Council and Other Highways Matters

Members were informed of the 2026 to 2027 briefing sessions programme hosted by West Sussex County Council. Details would be circulated to all councillors outside of the meeting.

44. Masterplan – North Littlehampton

Substitute plans had been added to strategic applications for the Hampton Park development in North Littlehampton. The committee received details of three updated applications, previously circulated, which also contained their comments previously submitted in January 2026. The committee maintained its previously submitted comments.

It was resolved that:

No changes be made to the committee's previous comments.

45. Exempt Business

There was none.

The meeting was closed at 7.08pm.

_____

Chair

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee on 5 October 2026.
Representation on Lists 37, 38 and 39

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
37	Beach	BW	LU/204/26/L	Listed building consent for the replacement of dilapidated rear escape staircase.	37 South Terrace Littlehampton BN17 5NU	**No Objection**
37	Brookfield	JL	LU/207/26/PL	Installation of a drive-through lane to serve the existing Burger King restaurant. This application affects a Public Right of Way. Is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	Burger King Restaurant Worthing Road Littlehampton BN17 6LE	**Objection:** The committee objected to the application and raised concerns of the proposed plans restricting access and generating traffic onto roads that are frequently crowded. The drive-through's exit would put additional strain on the small roundabout which already hosts high amounts of traffic and is in a poor condition. Parking provisions were also considered to be insufficient.

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee on 5 October 2026.
Representation on Lists 37, 38 and 39

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
38	Courtwick with Toddington	FT	LU/174/26/PL	Erection of a detached dwelling with open carport. This application affects the setting of listed buildings, is in CIL Zone 2 and is CIL Liable as a new dwelling.	Flint Acre Toddington Lane Littlehampton	**No Objection:** The committee had no objections to the applications and encouraged the applicants suggested biodiversity enhancements.
38	Wickbourne	FT	LU/209/26/HH	Retrospective application for the erection of a 1.8m boundary fence adjacent to the public highway.	97 Arundel Road Littlehampton	**No Objections:** The committee had no objections but were disappointed to see the habitat lost. Members encouraged the conditional requirement to replenish planting, exceeding what was previously there.
39	River	JD	LU/189/26/L	Listed building consent for replacement of 5 no. sash windows at the rear of the property.	Harbour House 61 Surrey Street Littlehampton	**No Objections.**

Appendix 1

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee on 5 October 2026.
Representation on Lists 37, 38 and 39

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
39	Courtwick with Toddington	FT	LU/227/26/CLP	Lawful development certificate for the proposed demolition and erection of a single storey side extension.	1 Seaton Close Littlehampton	**No Objections.**

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee 2 November 2026
Representation on Lists 41, 42, and 43.

Appendix A

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
42	River	JD	LU/255/26/PL	Partial demolition of number 57 River Road, change of use and redevelopment to provide a flatted development comprising 9 No apartments with private amenity space, parking and cycle storage, including the partial demolition of the adjacent boundary wall to provide a new pedestrian access and the creation of a floating pontoon with resident mooring spaces (resubmission following LU/141/25/PL). This application affects the character and appearance of the Littlehampton River Road Conservation Area and is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	57 River Road Littlehampton BN17 5DD	
42	Courtwick with Toddington	FT	LU/203/26/HH	Installation of an Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) Aira 8kW outdoor unit and internal 200 litre cylinder.	Forge Cottage Lyminster Road Wick Littlehampton BN17 7PS	
42	Courtwick with Toddington	FT	LU/193/26/L	Listed Building Consent for the installation of an Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) Aira 8kW outdoor unit and internal 200 litre cylinder.	Forge Cottage Lyminster Road Wick Littlehampton BN17 7PS	
42	River	JD	LU/247/26/PL	Damp and fire remediation works to external wall to remove combustible materials from buildings elevations. This application may affect listed buildings, affects the Littlehampton River Road Conservation and is	Sandpiper House, Osprey House and Saltmarsh House Old Market Lane	

LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
Planning and Transportation Committee 2 November 2026
Representation on Lists 41, 42, and 43.

Appendix A

Plan List No.	Ward	Ward Councillor	Planning No.	Details of Application	Location	Comments
				in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	Littlehampton BN17 5FB	
42	Beach	BW	LU/239/26/PL	Erection and re-location of new detached pre-fabricated garage building for theatrical props and scenery storage, including demolition of existing store. Revised proposal to previously approved under LU/68/26/PL. This application is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	Littlehampton Sportsfield St Floras Road Littlehampton BN17 6BD	
43	Wick	FT	LU/256/26/CLE	Lawful development certificate for an existing rear dormer.	14 Swanbourne Road Littlehampton BN17 6HS	
43	River	JD	LU/257/26/PL	New higher security fencing and gate systems. Is in CIL Zone 4 (Zero Rated) as other development.	Police Station East Street Littlehampton BN17 6AR	

Planning Scheme of Delegation Changes – Information for Parish and Town Councils

New legislation which imposes a National Scheme of Delegation on all councils in England, will be in force from October 2026 Arun District Council (ADC) will be operating in accordance with this legislation.

The comments of the Parish / Town Council, number of objections, or ADC member 'call in', will not be relevant to whether an application is determined at ADC's Planning Committee. Parish / Town Council comments will still represent the community's views and interests, and be considered alongside all other comments in the determination of applications.

Applications will be divided into different tiers, as follows:

Tier A Applications (aka Schedule 1)

The Regulations state these applications must be determined by officers in all instances.

Tier B Applications (aka Schedule 2)

Subject to passing the 'gateway test', these applications may be determined by Planning Committee.

Please note - where applications are in accordance with site allocations, these should not be considered to raise significant planning matters and should not be referred to committee in line with the gateway test

Gateway Test

Decides whether a Tier B will be determined at Planning Committee.

Code	Application Type	ADC Application Tier	Does LTC Comment?
A	Advert Consent	Tier B – Unlikely to pass gateway test.	Yes
CLE	Lawful Development Certificate for an Existing Use or Development	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	Yes
CLP	Lawful Development Certificate for Proposed use or Development	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	Yes
DOC	Matters Reserved By Condition Application	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	No – Relates to an application already commented on by LTC
NMA	Non Material Amendment	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	No – Relates to an application already commented on by LTC
PD	Prior Approval Notification	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	Yes
PDH	Larger Householder Extension	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	Yes
PL / HH	Planning Application (Minor) Residential: up to 9 dwellings Commercial: up to 1,000sqm of floor space. Household Applications	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	Yes
PL	Planning Application (Major) Residential: over 10 dwellings	Tier B – Likely to pass gateway test and be taken to committee.	Yes

Code	Application Type	ADC Application Tier	Does LTC Comment?
	Commercial: over 1,000sqm of floor space		
RES	Reserved Matters Planning Permission (non-phased)	Tier A – Officers in all instances.	Yes
RES	Reserved Matters Planning Permission (for phased schemes)	Tier B – Likely to pass gateway test and be taken to committee.	Yes
S73	Section 73 application to vary or remove a planning condition	Tier B – Likely to pass gateway test and be taken to committee.	Yes
T	Works to a Protected Tree	Tier B – Unlikely to pass gateway test.	No – It's subject to arboriculturist expertise.
TC	Works to a Tree in a Conservation Area	Tier B – Unlikely to pass gateway test.	No – It's subject to arboriculturist expertise.

How to contact us
Write to: Manor House, Church Street,
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5EW
Email: ltc@littlehampton-tc.gov.uk
Call: 01903 732063
Find us online: www.littlehampton-tc.gov.uk
Town Clerk – Laura Chrysostomou

Littlehampton Town Council's response to Arun District Council's Off-Street Parking Strategy 2027 to 2030 consultation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the current consultation regarding Arun District Council's Off-Street Parking Strategy 2027 to 2030. This has been considered in detail by the Planning and Transportation committee members, they comments are reflected in the Town Council's response set out below:

Providing Safe Parking

The Council should introduce CCTV across all car parks through a phased programme to improve safety and surveillance, deter anti-social driving and support enforcement. Action Point 1 should be strengthened from "review" to "undertake and maintain an investment programme", demonstrating a clear commitment to improving car parks. Planned improvements for each site should also be published so residents can understand the programme.

Promoting a sustainable environment

The strategy should identify which EV charging bays are operational and explain how restrictions will be enforced. Consistent enforcement is needed to prevent non-electric vehicles from using these bays and to support effective use of the charging network.

Providing support for economic growth

The commitment to work with event organisers is welcomed, building on initiatives such as free parking before Christmas. The Council should also consider using suitable car parks as event spaces during quieter periods where alternative parking is available, providing valuable support for local events.

Technology

The strategy should include an ambition to join the National Parking Platform, allowing drivers to use a wider range of parking apps. This would improve convenience, particularly for visitors unfamiliar with local arrangements.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this written response.

Your reference number is WSCC-876497911.

Thank you for completing a request for a new Traffic Regulation Order. All proposals have an assessment and you will be informed of the outcome.

Are you: A local resident, group/organisation, council

First name: Martin

Last name: Bartholomew

Address:

Flat name/number	House name/number	Street	Town	County	Postcode
		MARINERS QUAY	LITTLEHAMPTON	WEST SUSSEX	BN17 5DA

Phone number:

Alternative phone number (optional):

Email address:

Name of the local county councillor you have discussed this request with: Cllr Nicky Borrett

Name of the village, town or city you would like the TRO on: Littlehampton

Name of the road you would like the TRO on: Terminus Place

Are there any other adjacent roads you require the TRO to be applied to?: Yes

Names of other roads you would like the TRO to apply to: River Road, Purbeck Place

Type of TRO requesting: Waiting / parking restrictions, Moving traffic restrictions

Why is the TRO necessary?: • Terminus Place is very narrow, so it is always a matter of single line traffic. Vehicles entering from either end cannot see clearly whether another vehicle is entering the other end at the same time. Gridlock often occurs - especially if a vehicle stops in the middle of Terminus Place e.g. to load/unload. (See first picture)
• Going south, Satnav often encourages use of Terminus Place. (the likely culprit in the second and third pictures in document attached below)
• Terminus Place was never built to carry today's greatly increased traffic. Modern cars and vans are often larger than those of earlier times. Bigger vehicles, such as emergency vehicles, will always struggle.
• Vehicles parked (even legally) on the east side can easily make life difficult for vehicles moving along the street. Parked vehicles themselves are vulnerable to damage; as are walls.
• Vehicles in the act of entering Terminus Place from the station end are often baulked part way through their manoeuvre when they see their way is blocked. This means they must reverse back into busy Terminus Road. Visibility to do that safely is very restricted; the corner is next to a bus stop and is directly opposite the busy station entrance.
• Baulked vehicles entering Terminus Place from the River Road end compromise the four-way junction there.

Please attach additional information to support your application.: 20260921 Proposal to make Terminus Place one way.docx

Is the TRO likely to have a further impact on adjacent/other roads/routes?: Yes

If yes, enter details if this TRO request will impact on other roads: Covered in detail in consultation document attached above.

Potential transfer of problem to Purbeck Place.
Could be better to upgrade existing "Give Way" sign to ""Stop)Four way junction River Road/River Road/Terminus Place/Mariners Quay.
Possible advantages in instituting some "Resident Only" parking.
Input from a River Road resident that one-way rule in River Road (western portion) needs stricter enforcement (e.g Traffic camera near Arun View)

Attach a sketch to help us understand more with your request: 20260921 Proposal to make Terminus Place one way.docx

Is there any funding available that can be contributed towards the cost of this TRO?: No

Proposal: TRO Make Terminus Place One-way, Northbound





It is proposed that Terminus Place be made one-way northbound, from River Road towards Terminus Road and Littlehampton Station, with consideration given to retaining two-way access for cyclists.

Terminus Place is too narrow to accommodate two-way traffic safely. Poor visibility, parked vehicles, deliveries, and larger vehicles frequently cause obstruction, forcing drivers to reverse—sometimes into busy Terminus Road near the station and bus stop. Pavement parking also creates difficulties for pedestrians, pushchairs, and mobility scooters.

Local feedback shows broad support for the proposal, principally on safety and congestion grounds. However, concerns have been raised that traffic could be displaced onto the narrower, access-only Purbeck Place and that the restriction may inconvenience some residents.

It is therefore requested that West Sussex County Council undertake a technical assessment and formal consultation, considering the proposal alongside:

- protection and enforcement for Purbeck Place.
- improved controls at the River Road junction.
- parking and pavement obstruction.
- enforcement of existing restrictions.
- access for cyclists; and
- consultation with residents, transport operators, and emergency services.

Below is a list of anonymised comments received from local residents between 2 and 21 September 2026, provided by the proposer. A summary of reasons for and against this proposal can be seen at the end of this document.

1. River Circle Committee: Sending your initial document around to members, asking them to respond to you directly. Personally, I agree with all the points you make, although in practice I simply avoid using it unless absolutely necessary. *(By MFB: Ergo: extra load on Town Centre)*

Councillor Comments:

2. Councillor Ricky Borrett, West Sussex County Council, Littlehampton Town Division: This sounds like a sensible proposal to me. If you need anything from me, please let me know.

3. Councillor Chistine Wiltshire, Littlehampton Town Council, River Ward. Hi Martin, Thank for your email. I can support your TRO in principle, for Terminus

Place to become one way in a northward direction. I do use this road myself often, going north and south on my bicycle. It is quite a crucial access for cyclists to get off the busy main road. So, it is important to me that access remains available both ways for cycles. I have also witnessed a dangerous situation recently where a car coming off the main road was forced back out by a large car who wouldn't give way travelling northward. For further guidance, as the application is with WSCC I would contact your West Sussex councillor. Cllr Ricky Borrett mailto:ricky.borrett@westsussex.gov.uk

Terminus Place / Road Comments:

4. I live at 1, Cyprus Villas on the corner of Terminus Place: What you are proposing is an excellent idea and definitely needs to be done. The damage done to my wall has been quite severe at times and I did in fact report it to the police. I rarely use Terminus Place to drive along due to the narrowness of the road and it's a nightmare if you have to reverse. I am surprised there hasn't been any accidents yet at the junction at the south end. the road is busy and having a one-way system would make the road safer and calmer. I agree with everything that is stated in the proposal that you have set up.

5. Terminus Place: My mum lives in Terminus Place and has done for the past 43 years. As you can imagine she has seen lots of changes which you have stated in your email. More traffic, larger vehicles, parking and accessing the road as a very busy, difficult road. We are in total agreement with the road being one way going to the North. I personally on many occasions have reversed onto the main road (Terminus Road) to let ongoing traffic coming up the road access as there is nowhere else to stop. (Also: The parking infringes on the very small footpath; the cars are parked on the pavement making access for pushchairs and mobility scooters difficult - pedestrians are then having to use the road for access.)

6. Terminus Place Resident (?) I'm dropping an email to show support for your proposal to make Terminus place one way going towards Terminus Road. It is much needed to make road use easier and safer in this small area.

7. Terminus Road Fairlight court resident: I am 87 and I use Terminus Road (Editor note: Place?) to walk home from the station in the dark as I cannot then see the uneven surface and have to walk on the road as the pavement is often blocked by cars. I think one way traffic would help.

Purbeck Place Comments:

8. Purbeck Place resident: Hello, as far as I can see this proposal would only push the problem on to Purbeck place where I live. This road is already access only either way which is completely ignored by most drivers. If motorists are not able to drive South from Terminus Road down Terminus place, they will just drive down Purbeck place. This is a very small narrow road, and the problem will become worse than Terminus place because there is literally nowhere to pass

on this very narrow access-only road.
Please look at this in a wider context than the original proposal.

9. Purbeck Place resident: As a resident of Purbeck place! I find your proposal concerning! Our road is even tighter! It would mean people using our road as a rat run! This concerns me and other residents in our road! And yes, our road is also two-way access! Luckily access from mariners Quay towards the Arun view is one way! Creating a North bound road out of terminus road would mean people using our road as an alternative route! Maybe worth taking a walk and having a look at what that would mean to us please, many thanks.

10. Netley Court Resident I would favour traffic directions kept as they are. I live inside Netley Court so use all directions regularly on my way hither and thither. I always stop coming south on River Road and am very glad I do give the number of people going too fast left out of Terminus Place onto River Road.

River Road Comments:

11. River Road Resident: I fully support the proposal of a one-way Terminus Place going towards the station. I also feel that resident parking permits would be a good idea for both Terminus Place and River Rd. River Road seems to be the road of choice for long term holiday parking as it is so close to the station for the Gatwick Express, I recently saw a car parked outside a neighbour's house for 6 weeks! This is so unfair to the whole community that struggle to park as most of the homes do not have off street parking. Thank you for taking the time to raise this issue with Arun.

12. River Road Resident: completely agree that it should be one-way going north. However, I think the problem is mostly caused by cars trying to avoid the pedestrian crossing in Surrey Street and using Terminus Place as a rat run. There is a notice by the paying machine on the River Road/Surrey Street junction that says, 'no access to Terminus Place.' It's been there for years, but no one takes a blind bit of notice. I think it was put there for some roadworks which were finished years ago. Perhaps it could be enforced? If River Road were closed to through traffic, the problems you are experiencing might disappear

13. We have a place at The Waterside, River Road: Many thanks for your proposal to make Terminus Place one-way going north. It would be so much better if Terminus Place were one-way going north. We almost never use Terminus Place going south as the one-way system
means we cannot get to The Waterside that way, but when we leave The Waterside, we have to turn right into River Road, and our first way north is at Terminus Place. Life gets very difficult when you are halfway along the road and a vehicle appears at the northern end particularly if it is not minded reversing back.

14. River Road resident: I totally support you and your plan. This should have been done many years ago.

15. River Road Resident: I support a one-way north. I got a TRO to remove the yellow lines in River Road from just below Arun View to Terminus Place on the east side. The council were very helpful. You fill in a form online and people can vote on-line. or, they have a paper version that can be used as a petition. You need to email Fire and Police Services, support from local councillors, local businesses (if relevant), and overwhelming resident support. I gave people the option to vote on-line and a few of us took the petition door to door. We had the best result with door-to-door. It was really easy and the council were excellent. Good luck.

Mariners Quey Comments:

16. Mariners Quay Resident: I strongly support your well-argued proposal. I agree that one-way north would be an improvement. Also, I would also prefer that the *"give way"* sign in River Road at that four-way junction should be a "*stop "sign*. It is actually a very complicated junction. Many drive straight through, so that those exiting Mariners Quay cannot rely on right of way over those coming from the left, while also having to look out for cyclists from the right who themselves have right of way towards River Road west.

17. Mariners Quay Resident (contributor of the photographs): Great idea -Terminus Place is *chaotic* many, many times a day. Our window is a good viewing point. Definitely going north please!

18. Mariners Quay Resident: One-way towards the station sounds best to me.

19. Mariners Quay Resident: I would think to make it southward to minimise the additional traffic between the Arun View and our entrance. That residential stretch is already tight and sometimes even without the cyclists. (?)

20. Mariners Quay Resident (involved with 1-15 residents' association). **T**hanks for popping through my door that brilliant proposal to make Terminus Place one-way; I whole-heartedly support it. We spend a lot of time at each AGM head-scratching solutions to the frequent turning of vehicles in our courtyard. I think if Terminus Place was one-way, it would help reduce this.

21. Mariners Quay Resident: Both I and my wife agree to making terminus place a one-way street going north. Although we use it both ways, it is a logical suggestion to avoid congestion

22. Mariners Quay Resident: We were just discussing this at the weekend and feel that making the road one way is a much safer option. The Sat Nav takes you up/down this road and if you do not know the road lay out you will naturally use this route, and at times this can cause chaos. We avoid the road because it is not safe with obstructions and limited visibility and echo the previous comments about adding to the congestion driving through the town, making this road one way will mean the road is easier and safer to use and reduce traffic through the town.

23. Mariners Quay resident: Thank you for your recent leaflet and the efforts you are making to help sort out the traffic issues in our local area. Terminus Place is a nightmare, and I no longer drive down (or up) that road. Personally, I believe it would be safer for that road to be inaccessible to traffic full stop, but assume that will add to the chaos? So, I would support a one-way system going north towards the station with the change of a “give way” to a “Stop” sign as already suggested.

24. Mariners Quay Resident.

1. I am concerned that this suggestion is trying to solve a problem that doesn’t exist for the vast majority of drivers. I’m not saying that congestion does not happen, but avoidance is simple. Terminus Place is not a major (or even a minor) through route and if it is obstructed then this is clearly visible before entry at either end. Its only 100m long and if it is blocked then drivers can simply not turn in. I use Terminus Place if heading west towards the A259 rather than go round the town centre, but on the odd occasion that it is obstructed I go another way.
2. As for the picture you have attached, this seems (tell me if I am wrong!) to show vehicles all heading in the same direction and waiting to exit onto Terminus Road where there may have been an obstruction. Making the road one way wouldn’t make the slightest improvement to this situation. *(Editor’s note. Quite correct. No intention to mislead; the picture was only intended to give a sense of the road and its narrowness.)*
3. A cause of obstruction that I am aware of is where there are deliveries to houses in Terminus Place. When this happens, other drivers just have to be patient while unloading takes place. Again, one way working wouldn’t solve this.
4. When evaluating this suggestion, the Highways Authority will assess the “harm” that the current situation causes and to whom. As far as I am aware no-one has been injured but there is the potential for some minor “wing mirror” type damage to parked vehicles belonging to residents of Terminus Place although I am not aware of any specific instances. The only harm is frustration to drivers who from time to time use the road as a cut through and may find it difficult to navigate because of oncoming traffic. For them, the solution is easy, just go another way.
5. In my view, the only people who should have a say on this suggestion are the Terminus Place residents themselves as they are the only road users who have to use it. There are 11 properties and a block of flats, and they should have the majority say. There only seem to be 2 comments quoted in the attached paper on behalf of Terminus Place residents; one has a (?) on it indicating it may not be from a Terminus Place resident, and the other is not from a resident but a family member.
6. Making the road one way would inconvenience them significantly as they would be restricted in the way that they can enter and leave their

properties. For example, if the road were to be southbound only, a Terminus Place resident who wants to go towards (say) Tesco's can currently go north and turn left at the top. If one way southbound, they would have to go round the town centre one way system. Similarly, if the road were to be one way northbound and they wanted to drive to the shops in Surrey Street, they would also have to drive all the long way round the town centre one way system. If I were them, I would be very frustrated with this.

7. On the other hand, Terminus Place residents may have strong feelings if their vehicles are being damaged but there is no evidence that this happens.
8. As for the rest of us, we are merely "rat runners" and perhaps out of courtesy to Terminus Place residents we shouldn't be using the road at all (like the neighbouring Purbeck Place which is residents' access only).
9. If this suggestion is to be put forward in my view it is essential that the direction of traffic is northbound (towards the station). Making the road southbound only would make River Road into a cul-de-sac for traffic entering from the town centre end. Drivers are unlikely to spot any "No Through Road" signage and would end up at the junction of Terminus Place with River Road with no escape. Their only alternative would be to turn round (probably in the Mariners Quay 1-15 parking area) and return to the town centre. I am sure that this would not be popular with Mariners Quay 1-15 residents!
10. If any change is felt to be necessary, a more pragmatic solution might be to get the double yellow lines on the west side repainted so that it is clear that parking can only be on the east side as most of the lines seem to have disappeared over the years. This could be a request to West Sussex Highways who can do this as a maintenance project at little cost. With no parking on the west side, the road effectively becomes a single-track road with passing place (namely the entrance to the old garage site and the flats) as is common in many other places.
11. If further action is thought necessary, then the road could be made priority to one direction which would make it clear who should give way in the event of vehicles coming from both ends at the same time. This wouldn't prevent travel in either direction but would resolve any driver disputes. In this case I would suggest north to south to give priority to vehicles turning in from the station end.
12. Be aware that implementing Traffic Management Orders is an expensive business for Highways Authorities because of the extensive consultation required by legislation which dwarfs the cost of any signage required.
13. In summary I'm not convinced that this suggestion is either necessary or a good use of Council Taxpayers' (our) money!

25. Mariners Quay resident: We have lived here for 16 years and our apartment faces Terminus Place from River Road. During that time, we have seen emergency service vehicles and delivery lorries entering from the north as instructed by sat nav, unable to gain access or get jammed halfway down the road. Because the road is so narrow, vehicles park on the footpath restricting safe passage for push chairs and mobility scooters which are forced to divert into the busy road. This is a dangerous manoeuvre and should be acted on now before an accident occurs and not after. To avoid this situation the ideal solution is to make Terminus Place one way heading north and yellow lines introduced down its entire length to stop vehicles blocking the footpath. Residents and heavy vehicles can access River Road at the Arun View where the road is wider. PS, when necessary, we can provide more details of our reasons for recommending a one-way system heading north.

Riverside Wharf Comments:

26. Riverside Wharf Resident: I and (name deleted for privacy) support the proposal to make Terminus Place one-way in a northerly direction. We also endorse contacting our Littlehampton Town Council councillors, our County Councillor and applying for a Permanent Traffic Regulation Order.

27. Riverside Wharf Resident: I agree with making Terminus Place one way going to Terminus Road. It gets a bit complicated when vehicles are coming down from the main road. Also maybe include traffic camera up by Arun View as we are getting lots more vehicles taking the chance of going upriver Road the wrong way!! Maybe continuing the double yellow lines from outside our properties to include the section of pavement which is outside what was Trevor's garage to stop the parking of the big transit vans which obscure our vision when leaving our garage!!

Britannia Quey Comments:

28. Britannia Quay Resident: I totally agree with this proposal. Living at Britannia Quay, I use the road going north all the time to avoid the town centre. Not having the thought of meeting vehicles travelling south would be wonderful.

Pharos Quey Comments:

29. Pharos Quay Residents: My husband and both fully support your proposal.

Proposal: TRO Make Terminus Place One-way, Northbound

Main reasons for the proposed TRO

- Improved safety: The road is very narrow, with poor visibility and little room for vehicles to pass. Drivers sometimes have to reverse into busy Terminus Road.
- Reduced congestion and conflict: Two-way traffic frequently causes obstruction, gridlock, and disputes over who should reverse.
- Safer pedestrian access: Parked vehicles can block the narrow pavement, forcing pedestrians, mobility-scooter users, and people with pushchairs into the road.
- Protection from damage: Residents report damage to walls and concern about parked vehicles being struck.
- Suitability for current traffic: larger cars, vans, delivery vehicles, and emergency vehicles can struggle to use the road safely.
- Northbound is the preferred direction: It maintains a useful route from River Road towards the station and avoids making River Road effectively a cul-de-sac.
- Reduced town-centre traffic: Some respondents believe a reliable northbound route would reduce diversions through congested parts of the town centre.
- Strong local support: Most comments favour a northbound one-way system, including support in principle from two councillors.

Main reasons against, or concerns raised

- Displacement to Purbeck Place: The most significant concern is that southbound traffic may divert to this even narrower, access-only road.
- Limited evidence of serious harm: One respondent argues that congestion is occasional, avoidable and has not been shown to cause injuries or significant vehicle damage.
- Inconvenience for Terminus Place residents: A one-way restriction would require some residents to take longer routes to reach local destinations.
- It would not solve every obstruction: Deliveries, unloading and queues at the northern exit could continue even with one-way traffic.
- Cost and proportionality: A TRO involves consultation and expense, which may not be justified if the benefits are limited.
- Alternative measures may suffice: Suggestions include repainting the double yellow lines, improving parking enforcement or giving one direction priority while retaining two-way access.
- Cyclist access: There is support for retaining two-way access for pedal cycles.
- Direction of travel: One respondent favour southbound operation, although most who support a TRO prefer northbound.