

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: James Cross
FROM:	WSCC - Highway Authority
DATE:	17 September 2021
LOCATION:	Woodgate Centre Oak Tree Lane Chichester PO20 3GU
SUBJECT:	AL/107/21/PL Demolition of the Woodgate Centre buildings (including 3 No. residential dwellings) and the construction of 180 No. residential dwellings with the creation of new vehicular access with footways and cycleways, ancillary road infrastructure, emergency access arrangements, associated parking, public open space, including children's play space, landscape planting, surface water attenuation and drainage and other associated infrastructure. This site is in Cil Zone H SP2, BEW Strategic Site and is not CIL Liable.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	10 th September 2021
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	£ See below for breakdown

This is the first WSCC Highways (CHA) response to the above planning application for demolition of the Woodgate Centre buildings (including 3 No. residential dwellings) and the construction of 180 No. residential dwellings with the creation of new vehicular access with footways and cycleways, ancillary road infrastructure, emergency access arrangements, associated parking, public open space, including children's play space, landscape planting, surface water attenuation and drainage and other associated infrastructure.

Site location and access.

The site is located to the east of the A29 Lidsey Road and to the south of the existing railway line running east - west through Woodgate village. It is accessed via the eastern-most part of Woodgate Road. The site's location is illustrated in red in Figure 1.1 within the applicant's Transport Assessment.

Access is shown as a continuation of Woodgate Road in the form of a central spine road with a number of roads leading off it north and south. At the point it joins the A29 Lidsey Road, the junction is shown provided with a right hand turning 'pocket' in the centre of the A29. Added to this are widened footways to provide shared-use walking and cycling facilities with an uncontrolled crossing point over the A29.

Policy considerations.

Given the site's location, the TA refers to a number of the policies relevant to the current development plan for Arun District Council (ADC). They are as follows:

- ADC Adopted Local Plan 2011-2031
- Aldingbourne Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014-2034)
- ADC Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document January 2020
- ADCBEW Framework Masterplan

The site forms part of the wider strategic allocation referred to as Barnham, Eastergate and Westergate (BEW) under Policy H SP2c (SDS) within the adopted ADC Local Plan 2011-2031.

Proposed highways works.

The scheme proposes a modification to the junction of Woodgate Road with the existing A29 Lidsey Road in the form of a right-hand turning lane.

Additional to this are shared foot and cycle paths – one section along the northern-side of Woodgate Road and then continuing northwards along the A29 – firstly along the eastern-side of the road and then along the western side, terminating just before the junction with Hook Lane found north of the railway crossing (shown on submitted drawing 20-061-014 Revision 'E').

With regard to the changes shown, the applicant should provide further information to demonstrate how such works comply with the relevant sections of DMRB (for the road works) and for the cycle works, LTN 1/20. Specifically with regard to the widened footway (to provide shared use – foot and cycle) along the northern-side of Woodgate Road, the applicant should explain how this is achieved (i.e. does it require any narrowing of the existing carriageway of Woodgate Road or is it wholly accommodated within the existing footway and verge running along that side of the road)?

The applicant should note that the realignment of the footway on the western side of the A29 to cater for the increased width for the right turn lane in to Woodgate Road might have an impact upon the existing ditch and new culverts that are part of the Wings Nursery design. If approved, the applicant (of the Woodgate Centre) would need to meet the costs of all the necessary changes.

Please also see comments made about the route under 'Road Safety Audit' found below.

Internal layout.

From scrutiny of the plans provided for the internal layout, it is apparent that at some junctions on the main 'spine road' running E-W through the development that raised table features might be offered. Given the relative straightness of the alignment of the roads, this form of traffic management should be provided at each junction along the spine road.

In addition to the above, where traditional roads with footways become shared-surface roads, the tie-ins for the footways should be further into the shared surface roads.

For the shared foot/cycleway running through the site using the alignment of the spine road – initially on the northern-side but then transferring to the southern-side, the current arrangement would require cyclists to give-way to drivers at the junctions.

Where appropriate to do so, LTN 1/20 does encourages designers to design for cyclists and pedestrians having priority at junctions. Looking at the current plans, this would require amendments to the internal layout to enable this. While it might be difficult to achieve such an arrangement for those crossing N-S across the spine road as they enter or leave the site, the designer might be able to consider the side road junctions as such if an appropriate set-back can be achieved in-line with the LTN.

With regard to the internal paths shown running-around the boundary of the development (internal to the site) and that shown running north to Oak Tree Lane and land to the north, the applicant should show how these would be suitable for foot and cycle access.

For all cycle infrastructure, the applicant should provide a commentary demonstrating how it meets the requirements of LTN 1/20.

A plan showing all the above to be provided. For any changes to the junction priorities for pedestrians and cyclists, the applicant should run these past the Road Safety Audit team for comments.

Road Safety Audit.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit forms part of the submission. This has considered all the proposed highways works.

Two Problems were identified in the report. They are:

1. Problem 2.1 – Lidsey Road.

Summary: Sections of shared-use cycle facility are shown to be sub-standard and may lead to accidents.

The audit team noted that the proposed shared-use cycle facilities are shown to be 2.5m-wide instead of the recommended 3.0m as-per current national standards. They consider that the sub-standard width could lead to cycle/pedestrian collisions.

2. Problem 2.2 – Lidsey Road.

Summary: The lack of safe facilities for cycles to re-join the carriageway may lead to accidents.

The audit team noted that the proposed cycle facility ends at the Lidsey Road/Hook Lane junction and there is no indication of how cycles would re-join the carriageway. Northbound cyclists would have very poor visibility at the Hook Lane junction due to no footway on the south-side and leaving the shared-use facility to the carriageway may lead to vehicle/cycle collisions.

Designer's Response.

Audit Team Problem No.	Audit Team Problem	Audit Team Recommendation	Design Organisation's Response	Overseeing Organisation's Response	Agreed Action
2.1	<i>Location:</i> Lidsey Road. <i>Summary:</i> Sections of the shared-use cycle	Recommendation: It is recommended that all sections of the shared-use	Agree/Disagree. Partly agree: That the current	Agree with Design Organisation.	That the route be provided to

	facility are shown to be sub-standard and may lead to accidents. The Audit Team noted that the proposed cycle facility, a shared-use cycle/pedestrian facility between Woodgate Road and Hook Lane and the whole of Woodgate Road are shown to be 2.5m in width although the current national standard for a shared-use cycle/pedestrian facility is 3.0m. The sub-standard width may lead to cycle/pedestrian collisions.	facility are upgraded to be 3.0m in width.	national standard for a shared-use facility is 3.0m. However, WSCC cycleway design guide also states that 2.5m is the absolute minimum acceptable width for such a facility. Therefore, adhering to the above, where highway land is available, 3.0m wide shared facility is proposed, whereas 2.5m wide facility is proposed where 3.0m is not possible.		2.5m wide but where possible, 3.0m is to be provided.
2.2	<i>Location:</i> Lidsey Road. <i>Summary:</i> The lack of safe facilities for cycles to re-join the carriageway may lead to accidents. The Audit Team noted that the proposed cycle facility ends at the Lidsey Road/Hook Lane junction and there is no indication of how cycles should re-join the carriageway. Northbound cyclists would	Recommendation: It is recommended that the shared-use facility is terminated south of the level crossing with suitable signage and dropped kerbs.	Agree/Disagree. Partly agree: However, the shared-use facility has not been terminated south of the level crossing. Instead, the latest drawing has been updated to show how the cyclist safely re-joins the carriageway with appropriate dropped-kerbs, signage and tactile paving before	Agree with Audit Team. Introducing cyclists to the carriageway adjacent to Hook Lane will be at a location where visibility is limited around the corner into Hook Lane. Furthermore, the junction can be busy and adding another 'movement' could potentially lead to conflicts between	Terminate shared-use facility as-per the Audit Team's recommendation with appropriate markings and signage.

	have very poor visibility at the Hook Lane junction due to no footway on the south-side and leaving the shared-use facility to the carriageway may lead to vehicle/cycle collisions.		reaching Hook Lane junction. This is to ensure cyclist's facility is available as far as possible.	users. And the section crossing the railway crossing is also narrow and sub-2.5m wide which could also introduce conflicts between users.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

The Design Organisation should reply to the above. And, a plan should be submitted showing the revisions documented above.

Road safety history.

At the pre-application stage, the CHA requested that a review of Personal Injury Accidents (PIA) that have occurred in the local highway network during the latest 10-year period should be included in the TA supporting the application. As such, the applicant has obtained such data from Sussex Police for the latest available 10-year period covering 01/12/2010 to 30/07/2020. The extent of study area includes the A29 corridor between and including the War Memorial roundabout to the north and the A29/A259 roundabout to the south.

Sustainable access.

The applicant acknowledges that planning policy places strong emphasis on the integration of land use, transport and planning decisions. To ensure developments are sustainable, they should be accessible to local amenities, schools and public transport services by a choice of sustainable transport modes such as walking, cycling and public transport.

Manual for Streets (MfS) considers 800m to be comfortably accessible distance on foot and states that walking has the potential to replace short car trips of up to 2km. Whereas, CIHT's 'Planning for Walking' document reports that approximately 80% of journeys shorter than 1 mile (1.6 km) are made wholly on foot. Based on these, walking distance of up to 2km and cycling distance of up to 5km to such local amenities are generally considered to be acceptable.

The applicant considers that the site is located within easy access on foot and cycle to the amenities and services of Woodgate, Aldingbourne and Westergate to the north of the site. However at the present time, provision for cyclists is limited and only slightly improved with the offer from this development. Most will still be reliant on using the existing A29 for journeys north and south of the development until such time as the rest of BEW is constructed and links provided to and from that site. In addition, public footpaths are available to the north of the level crossing as illustrated in Figure 3.4 found in the TA although require users to leave the site to get to them. These provide connections between the site and schools and amenities in Eastergate. However, the potential to link to them through the site and adjacent sites within BEW will not arise until sometime into the future. What is not shown, however, is how such links will be made – particularly to the north and east of the site. The applicant should provide more information about this and a plan showing how the site would fit-in with the Masterplan for the rest of the BEW allocation.

A list of local amenities available within walking and cycling distances from the site are tabulated in Table 3.1 found in the TA. The location of these amenities relative to the site along with 800m and 2km isochrones are illustrated in Figure 3.5 of the TA. It should also be noted that the BEW allocation site to the east will provide two new primary schools, two local centres which – when provided - will include shops and library facility, and these will be within reach from the site.

Public transport is currently limited in the locality although is expected to improve in-line with developments in the BEW allocation as they come forward. As such, this site will be expected to contribute towards a public transport strategy for both new and improved bus services and associated infrastructure. It is acknowledged that the applicant is offering the same stops, shelters, real-time passenger information as that secured from the nearby Wings Nursery site. However, if that site is built-out first, then the offer from the Woodgate Centre for that same infrastructure might fall away. The applicant should, therefore, provide more detail of discussions with local bus providers and what strategy is proposed for the BEW development site as a whole and what its contribution to that will be.

For information purposes, it should be noted that planning application No. AL/55/21/PL - Proposed demolition of existing post office and to replace with new food store is, at the time of writing, a 'live' planning application for a proposed new food store to be re-built in accordance with previously approved scheme to alter the existing building application No. AL/53/20/PL on the former Aldingbourne Stores site found north of the railway crossing.

Connection into Church Commissioner's land (to east of site).

Reference is made in the TA to a future connection for walking and cycling purposes into the land adjacent (east) currently in the ownership or control of the Church Commissioners. An indicative alignment is also shown on one of the submitted drawings. However, what isn't clear is who will provide it. The CHA recommends that this be provided by the applicants and secured by S106 Agreement.

Traffic impact.

Section 6 in the TA considers various development scenarios, namely:

- 2038 – Do minimum with new A29 fully open (***without*** development at Woodgate Centre)
- 2038 – Do minimum with new A29 fully open (***with*** development at Woodgate Centre)

With regard to junctions reviewed for possible modelling, the following were examined:

1. A29/Woodgate Road
2. A29/'CALA Homes' junction
3. A29 /Nyton Road junction
4. A29/B2233 War Memorial Junction with Barnham Road
5. A29/New A29 Northern Section junction
6. A29/Eastergate Lane Junction
7. A29/Wandleys Lane Junction
8. A29/A27Junction
9. A29/A259 (Rowan Way)
10. A29/A259 (Felpham Relief Road)
11. A29 - Proposed new Shripney Road connection

In-line with recognised guidance, only those junctions where an increase of 30 or more trips is identified have been modelled. They are as follows:

1. A29/Woodgate Road
2. A29/Hook Lane
3. A29/'CALA Homes' access
4. A29/Nyton Road triangular junction
5. A29/B2233 War Memorial Roundabout with Barnham Road

For the scenarios tested at each junction, the 'with development' scenarios all show increases in both traffic and associated delays. However, the increases are relatively small and not considered severe in the opinion of the CHA. This is likely attributable to the new A29 being in-place which effectively by-passes the existing A29, thereby reducing traffic flows on the 'old' road (A29) and road junctions along it.

Woodgate railway crossing.

The traffic assessment also includes reference to the future impact at the nearby Woodgate railway crossing. Again, in the two scenarios modelled, the impacts only appear to modestly increase with development added and like the junction modelling referred to above, impacts cannot be considered severe.

Opening year and interim scenarios.

As far as can be seen from scrutiny of the TA, no scenarios have been presented for either an opening year for the development nor any interim period when the new A29 – either in-part or full – has not been constructed. As such, this information is required using existing traffic flow information to enable the CHA to be able to see what any opening year and interim periods might look like traffic-wise until such time as the new A29 road has been built. This work should, in particular, include assessment of the impact at the junction of Woodgate Road with the existing A29 (alongside parked vehicles on Woodgate Road), the impact of the development at the junction when the railway crossing gates are down and the impact on the on the queues on the A29 when the gates are down. It should also include development traffic from the recently approved Wings Nursery development found nearby.

Finally, the applicant does not appear to have included any existing traffic impact associated with the site in its current guise. This should be provided including information about whether such uses are currently active. Comparison tables of new and existing development traffic impacts should be provided.

Parking.

Car parking – The requirements for parking and electric vehicle (EV) charging provision applicable to the site are set out in ADC's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) January 2020 and WSCC's Guidance on Parking September 2020. Table 4.2 in the TA sets out the comparison between the two council's parking guidance.

Added to the designated parking is visitor parking. visitor parking will be required to be provided at a ratio of 20% of the total number of residential units and accessible bays are required to a minimum of 5% of overall provision. A garage should be at least 6m x 3m internally to be regarded as an allocated parking space and each single garage will be counted as 0.5 allocated parking space.

The proposed on-site allocated and unallocated parking and EV charging provision are summarised below and the applicant has said that these are provided to meet the ADC and WSCC parking standards. Where there is shortfall in the allocated parking spaces, additional unallocated parking spaces are provided to supplement this as discussed below, and therefore, in overall, the proposed parking provision meets the requirement of both

guidance documents. The applicants have said that they consider it appropriate to provide a mixture of allocated and unallocated spaces as unallocated spaces tend to provide more flexible solution where spaces are then available to both visitors and residents:

- 1 allocated no. space per 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom flats;
- 2 allocated no. spaces per 2-bedroom FOG*, 2 FOGs have 1 no. space;
- 2 allocated no. spaces per house;
- 20 single garages and 10 double garages are provided in addition to the above spaces;
- 37 unallocated parking spaces are provided;
- 36 visitor spaces (20%)

(*FOG – 'flat over garage'/coach house etc.)

And for electric vehicle (EV) provision:

- All units with 2 No allocated parking spaces will have one space equipped with an EV charging socket;
- 4 additional unallocated spaces with EV charging socket, one each on four blocks of flats.

With regard to passive EV provision, the applicant should confirm that the appropriate infrastructure will be provided throughout the scheme in accordance with ADC requirements in order to future-proof the development.

Cycle parking – This is documented in paragraph 4.6.10 of the TA. It is recommended that wherever possible, 'Sheffield' style stands be used – particularly in the communal areas as these are generally easy to use. In addition to the allocated provision, some visitor parking should also be provided throughout the development layout. This should be shown on a plan.

Travel Plan.

A Residential Travel Plan (TP) has also been prepared for the proposed development. The TP presents measures would be implemented that the applicant considers would encourage future residents to adopt non-car modes of transport.

In its consideration of the measures included in the TP, the CHA is of the view that further measures are required, including penalty measures should targets for trip-rate reduction are not met. See comments below.

In addition to and in-accordance with WSCC Travel Plan policy, a standard Travel Plan monitoring fee of £3,500 will be required.

Both the TP and the monitoring fee must be secured by S106 Agreement.

Targets.

The headline target for the Travel Plan should be to achieve a 12-hour weekday vehicle trip rate that is 10% lower than that predicted for the site in the Transport Assessment assuming a Travel Plan were not implemented. This trip rate should be achieved within 5 years and sustained for the 5-year monitoring period. The Travel Plan should clearly state the number of trips expected between 7am and 7pm on a typical weekday (as should appear in the TA) and also the target number of trips (i.e. TA – 10%).

Monitoring and Auditing.

The Travel Plan should be monitored in accordance with the TRICS UK Standard Assessment Methodology (aka TRICS SAM). This involves 3 multi-modal surveys over a 5-year period whereupon the 10% trip rate reduction target should be achieved, or further TP measures implemented.

The developer/Travel Plan Coordinator should commission these directly with the TRICS organisation and should be secured through a Section 106 agreement.

Consideration will need to be given as to when the first of the TRICS SAM surveys should be conducted. The final survey should be conducted following final occupation. Therefore 50% occupation may prove to be a reasonable trigger point for the initial survey.

We require the developer to pay an auditing fee of £500 per survey. If the results show the TP is on track then a meeting to discuss remedial actions will not be required, and hence we will be able to offer a 25% discount on the fee.

Travel Plan Co-ordinator.

A Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC) should be appointed to deliver the Travel Plan.

The TPC should ensure that regular surveys are conducted in order to monitor progress towards targets.

The TPC should also provide a basic personal journey planning service to residents.

The TPC should be appointed prior to occupation of the first dwelling (ideally before the first unit goes on sale) and should be in place at least until the results of the final surveys are known.

Contact details for the TPC should be provided to this office on appointment. If possible, a planning condition should be applied that prevents occupation of the first dwelling until contact details for the TPC have been provided to the County Council.

Travel Information and Resident's Travel Packs.

Resident's welcome packs should include the following:

- A map of the local area highlighting local schools, shops, any areas of major employment, hospitals, doctor's surgeries, dentists, bus and rail stations, bus stops, and leisure facilities etc.
- Information about how to access the above by bus, including approximate journey times, route numbers etc and a cost comparison with car travel + parking
- Information about how to access the above on foot or by bicycle, including approximate journey times, route information etc, and a cost comparison with car travel + parking
- Information about areas served by any local rail station, including approximate journey times and a cost comparison with car travel + parking
- Details about grocery home delivery services operated by local shops and supermarkets, including the benefits such services offer compared to private car travel, such as reduced CO2 and greater convenience.
- Information about local bike shops offering discounts to residents living on developments where a Travel Plan is operating.

The CHA also requires to see some sort of travel voucher offering to the initial occupants of the residential units. Vouchers should be worth at least £150 per dwelling and could be exchanged for the following:

- a. A season ticket for the local bus service
- b. A rail season ticket or network card
- c. A contribution towards the purchase of a new bicycle and/or equipment
- d. Cycle training up to 4 members of the household (further details and course costs are available at www.westsussex.gov.uk/cycletraining)
- e. 12 months free membership to any local Car Club (including joining fee)

Developments served by Metrobus: For larger developments Metrobus may be able to supply welcome packs for people moving in, with bespoke travel info and a free trial smartcard. If the developer is able to make a financial contribution then Metrobus may also be able to offer significant discounts for residents over a longer period. For further details contact: [REDACTED]

Developments served by Stagecoach South: Stagecoach may be able to supply free 'taster' tickets for each resident and discounted Megarider tickets. Contact russel.byrne@stagecoachbus.com for details.

For sites in Adur & Worthing, Chichester, Crawley, and Mid Sussex (East Grinstead & Haywards Heath): The easitNETWORK is a business-led network which provides sustainable travel solutions to local employers. Member employers can access a number of incentives including 15% on Southern rail services, discounted bus travel, and a car sharing scheme. Information about any local easitNETWORK should be included in welcome packs.

The County Council has commissioned Pindar Creative's Travel Plan Mapping Solution. The service enables developers, employers, and other organisations to purchase site-specific multi-modal travel maps, notice boards, and interactive PDFs. The applicant may wish to consider using this service to produce the local travel information for the resident's welcome packs. Further details can be found on our website:

http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/travelwise/supporting_material.aspx

The County Council has produced a leaflet about our car sharing scheme, which is available on our web site and can be downloaded for inclusion in resident welcome packs and on any community web site that might be established. A video which explains how the scheme works is also available. The url is: www.westsussex.gov.uk/carsharing

The West Sussex Cycle Journey planner should be promoted in welcome packs and across the site, as should Traveline South East and National Rail Enquiries etc. The link to our cycle journey planner is <http://cyclejourneyplanner.westsussex.gov.uk/> and can also be accessed via the WSCC website: <https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure-recreation-and-community/walking-horse-riding-and-cycling-routes/cycle-journey-planner/>

Car club.

The site might benefit from the introduction of a car club. However, if it is found that commercial operators are not be interested in servicing the site, a not-for-profit operator, such as Co-Wheels, might be able to establish a car club at this development although this would be determined through direct discussion between the applicant and Co-Wheels (or similar company). This would require an initial period of funding from the developer until 20-40 regular users per vehicle is established in order to make the club self-sustaining. WSCC would estimate that a budget of around £30k would enable a

company such as Co-Wheels to provide 2 vehicles for 2 years (inc. maintenance) although the company itself would be able to confirm this. An alternative, and perhaps cheaper, option would be for the developer to provide vehicles and fund the installation on the relevant car club hardware. A maintenance charge would also apply in this case.

EV charging points.

It is acknowledged that the site is to be supplied with electric vehicle charging points. Existing charge points in West Sussex are part of the Energise Network and any points installed at this site may well benefit from being part of the same scheme. Further information is available on our web site:

http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/travelwise/electric_vehicle_charging_netw.aspx

It is also acknowledged that the LPA has it's own criteria for EV parking requirements and this should also be included in any consideration of such parking arrangements.

Promotion and Publicity.

National awareness events, such as those listed below, should be promoted by the TPC:

Walk to School Week

National Bike Week

Cycle to Work Day

European Mobility Week / Travelwise Week

Cycle September

National Liftshare Week

International Walk to School Month

Road Safety Week

The County Council has developed a suite of posters, which can be used to promote sustainable and active modes of travel. The artwork may be used free of charge and can be downloaded from our web site:

http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/leisure/getting_around_west_sussex/travelwise/supporting_material.aspx

Enforcement.

The Travel Plan should include provision for enforcement action that would be taken in the event that the 5-year target is not met. One option might be for a second round of travel vouchers to be offered to each dwelling should the 10% trip rate reduction target not be achieved by year 5.

Monitoring Fees.

For residential sites of between 80 and 500 units the applicant is required to pay a Travel Plan monitoring fee of £3,500 at the application stage.

S106.

Given that the site forms part of the Barnham-Eastergate-Westergate (BEW) Strategic Allocation, it will be required to provide suitable infrastructure (funding and physical measures) - both highways and non-highways - to support itself and the overall allocation.

In accordance with approved policy within the Arun Local Plan, the following will inform what contributions are required. All highways-related contributions to be based on Local Plan allocation of 3000 homes for the BEW Strategic Development Area:

Apportionment Study (<https://www.arun.gov.uk/transport-planning-policy/>) – A contribution proportional to the impact of the development on the overall BEW development site will be required to be secured by S106 Agreement.* Schemes set-out in this appropriate to BEW are as follows:

1. A29 re-alignment
2. A259 corridor improvements (Bognor Regis to Littlehampton)
3. A259 Oyster Catcher improvements
4. A27/Fontwell East RBT improvements
5. A27/Nyton Road improvements
6. Barnham Village Centre improvements

*(*Please note that current figures in Apportionment Study are, at the time of writing, under review and might increase at or before signing of any S106 Agreement should the planning proposal be permitted).*

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)** - The following works are considered applicable for the Woodgate Centre site to contribute to (and in addition to those set-out in the Apportionment Study):

1. Walking and cycle route and bridge over Lidsey Rife – To be delivered by applicant
2. Cycle links BEW to SDNP – estimated cost £500,000 – so $\frac{£500,000}{3000} = £166$ per-dwelling x 180 = £29,880
3. Barnham – Tangmere cycle route – estimated cost £1,500,000 – so $\frac{£1,500,000}{3000} = £500$ per-dwelling x 180 = £90,000
4. Barnham to Bognor Regis cycle route – estimated cost £1,150,000 – so $\frac{£1,150,000}{3000} = £383$ per-dwelling x 180 = £68,940
5. B2233 footway imps – estimated cost £1,150,000 – so $\frac{£1,150,000}{3000} = £383$ per-dwelling x 180 = £68,940
6. Additional cycle parking Barnham Station – estimated cost - £35,000 – so $\frac{£35,000}{3000} = £11.66$ x 180 = £2,098.80
7. Bus services – for applicant to put-forward proposals.
8. A29/B2233 War Memorial roundabout interim junction improvement – only necessary if A29 Realignment phase 1 is not implemented.
9. Creation of a dedicated NMU grade-separated railway crossing to provide a safe connection between sections of the proposed Rife Valley Park – proportionate contribution required from all development sites.
10. Creation of a dedicated NMU grade-separated railway crossing to provide a safe crossing of the Barnham-Bognor branch line linking various PRoW - proportionate contribution required from all development sites.
11. Site specific transport improvements identified through Transport Assessments – to be delivered by each applicant to mitigate the impact of each development site.

*(**Like the Apportionment Study, the costs quoted are under review and may change at or close-to the signing of any S106 Agreement should planning permission be granted).*

Travel Plan – The Travel Plan and its monitoring fees to be secured by S106 Agreement.

Non-highways infrastructure – list to be submitted separately.

Other matters.

Given the proximity to and impact on the railway crossing found on Lidsey Road (A29) by the development proposals, the case officer should also consult Network Rail.

Conclusion.

Additional information is required to enable the CHA to be able to consider the proposal further. The detail of this is found in the main body of the text in this report and summarised below:

1. Access and off-site highways works – demonstration how works comply with relevant design standards and guidance.
2. Foot and cycle bridge to eastern-side of development site - Confirmation that this will be delivered by the applicant and when.
3. Plan showing how the site will connect to other sites within the adjacent BEW Strategic Land Allocation with regard to non-motorised provision.
4. Details of public transport provision and associated service improvements and infrastructure contributions.
5. Provide drawing of revised off-site cycle works.
6. Consideration of changes to foot and cycle infrastructure within the development and how that meets the requirements of LTN 1/20.
7. Provision of a further response to the Road Safety Audit 'Log' (Designer's Response).
8. Modelling of existing and interim (pre-A29) scenarios + details of existing uses and comparisons with the proposed development in traffic-terms.
9. Cycle parking – visitor provision to be shown on a plan.
10. Travel Plan – revised version required with additional measures included.

Please re-consult when the above additional information is available, at which time the CHA will consider the proposals further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services