

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Mrs. A. Gardner
FROM:	Highways, WSCC – Tim Townsend
DATE:	25 th June 2018
LOCATION:	Blastreat Limited & adjacent Greenhurst, Fitzalan Road, Arundel, BN18 9JS
SUBJECT:	AB/36/18/PL Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a block of 46 No. sheltered apartments for the elderly (comprising 22 x one bedroom apartments and 24 x two bedroom apartments age restricted to 60 years and over), with associated access, electric buggy/cycle stores and refuse bin store and 32 No. parking spaces. Re-submission of AB/77/17/PL.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	20 th June 2018
RECOMMENDATION:	☒ Advice ☐ Objection ☐ Modification ☐ No Objection ☒ More Information ☐ Refusal
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	£TBA

This is the WSCC Highways and Transport (CHA) response to the above planning application for Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a block of 46 No. sheltered apartments for the elderly (comprising 22 x one bedroom apartments and 24 x two bedroom apartments age restricted to 60 years and over), with associated access, electric buggy/cycle stores and refuse bin store and 32 No. parking spaces.

Summary position of Highway Authority.

Additional information is required in order for the Highway Authority to consider the application further.

Access.

Vehicular access is shown in the north-western corner of the site adjacent to an access serving a British Telecom (BT) yard on drawing 1650 51A (Rev. 'A' dated 19/03/2018). This then leads along the western side of the building to a car parking that runs along the southern boundary of the site. Around the remainder of the northern flank of the building and that to the east, a margin is shown which appears to follow the line of the public highway. The applicant should provide an overlay of the highway boundary on the site proposal drawing and also indicate what they intend to do with the future use of this land. With regard to the actual access to the site, the neighbouring BT access has an angled 'flare' on its eastern side that appears to be omitted from the current planning drawing. Without this, it could make entry and exit to that site difficult and as such, should be reinstated. This will also mean that the access to the development itself will

need to be amended to ensure adequate bellmouth radii for turning vehicles. Amended plan required.

For those arriving on-foot, a short length of footway is proposed along the front of the site between the vehicular access and pedestrian entrance to the building. For pedestrians and users of mobility scooters or those pushing wheelchairs to gain access to the town centre, this would require them to cross Fitzalan Road and travel eastwards along a short footway that leads to a path running directly to Queen Street (the latter designated as an 'E-Class' section of highway). If this is to be the main non-car route, the applicant should also provide suitable ramps on both side of Fitzalan Road with tactile paving (avoiding the newly-created vehicular crossing now formed on the northern side of the road opposite). Neither are shown on the current drawings. The applicant should also demonstrate that this route is suitable for a choice of users as it narrows in places and does not appear to have ramps at all crossings/crossovers. Also with regard to the path between Fitzalan Road and Queen Street, the applicant should demonstrate that this is of sufficient width to cater for a choice of user including mobility scooter and wheelchair users – particularly as it is generally narrow and has guard railing (further narrowing the useable width at either end). To the north of this path and running to the south of Martlet's Court (through a car park) is a formal Public Right of Way (PRoW) – Public Footpath No. 3066_1. Suitability of this route should also be demonstrated.

Also on the non-car side of things, an access gate leading to a building with the letters 'GSHP' is shown. Applicant to explain what this means and what it is for. Also, how high will wall/fence/railing be either side of entrance here and will access be flat or have a gradient? For the bin store, doors are shown opening outwards to the footway. They should open inwards for safety reasons if they open over public highway (or land intended to be public highway). If they are to open over private land, adequate protection (bollards or similar) should be placed either side (but not on highway). An amended plan to show this should be provided.

Safety Audit.

In-acordance with WSCC Safety Audit policy, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be provided, with its brief being to consider all access points and changes to the highway network proposed as part of this planning application. A Designer's Response should also accompany it. When received, the Highway Authority will consider it.

Trip generation.

As for previous application AB/77/17/PL, trip generation has been considered using the TRICS database. Although this development varies very slightly from the previous submission by adding a further one bedroom apartment, the traffic impact remains almost identical (so approximately 4-5 additional movements in the AM peak period over the generation of the existing use).

Parking.

Car - 32 car parking spaces are proposed for the scheme, compared to 34 for the earlier application. Alongside this parking, space is shown to accommodate the parking and turning of delivery vehicles. However, it does look somewhat small and might not accommodate a larger vehicle. Therefore, its suitability should be demonstrated. Based on current WSCC parking guidance recommending 1 space per 2 dwellings, this amounts to 23 spaces for residents. This then leaves 9 spaces for staff, visitors etc. which based on the information provided about staff numbers, appears acceptable to the Highway Authority.

Bike and mobility scooters – From the information provided, it is not clear how many spaces are to be provided for each mode of transport. As such, a clear amended drawing should be provided with details of internal arrangements for such parking.

Furthermore, information about how numbers have been obtained should also be provided.

Servicing.

Although it is stated that refuse collection is proposed to take place from (and on) the highway, the LPA should consult their refuse contractor to check that this is acceptable. With regard to access by fire appliances, there appears to be lack of turning space to turn such vehicles around to the rear of the building. As such, this should be attended to and an amended plan provided showing how this would be addressed.

Conclusion.

Further information is required to enable the Highway Authority to consider the proposal further. This is documented in the main body of the report and summarised below:

1. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response for all proposed access points (vehicular and pedestrian) and other changes to the highway.
2. Neighbouring BT access 'reinstated' with flare and development site access amended accordingly and visibility splays shown for both.
3. Information about future use of land along eastern flank and north-eastern flank of building and plan showing highway boundary overlaid on development plan.
4. Plan to show crossing points (north and south-side) across Fitzalan Road to accommodate those walking, using mobility scooters and wheelchair users and demonstration of suitability of this route between site and footpaths.
5. Further information about suitability of current 'E-Class path between Fitzalan Road and Queens Street and Public Footpath 3066_1 to serve the development.
6. Further information about bin store doors and access to building with GSHP on it including boundary treatment at the point the path meets the highway.
7. Further information about suitability and ability of delivery vehicle turning area to accommodate and turn suitably-sized vehicles on-site.
8. Clearer plan showing bike and mobility scooter stores and information about what has informed provision/numbers etc.
9. Plan demonstrating that the parking area has the ability to turn a fire appliance in accordance with requirements.

Please re-consult with the additional information set-out above. When available, the Highway Authority will review the proposals further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services