

[REDACTED]

From: Tim Townsend [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 January 2022 11:00
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: 'dave.tighe' [REDACTED] Simon Davis <Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 2087 - Woodgate - AL/129/21/OUT - Response to highway officer consultation including design audit and departures from standards

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Brad,

Thank you for your email of 24 January 2022 found below. I also refer to your emails of 20 December 2021 and 19 January 2022 – the latter two with amended information which this email responds to further down in the text.

In reply to your points raised in your email of 24 January, my comments are as follows:

1. *Cycle connection (on eastern side of A29)* – You've shown a cycle connection on the western/site-side of the road coming out of the corner of the development but you haven't shown anything on the opposite side of the road to cater for southbound cyclists attempting to leave the carriageway, then lining-up to cross the road and then entering the development. For the avoidance of doubt, are you referring to the secondary pedestrian/cycle access in the northern part of the site? *Yes, I am. You've not shown any works on the opposite side of the road (eastern-side of A29) to cater for cyclists travelling south along the A29 and then wishing to leave the carriageway – cross the road – and then enter the site.*
2. *Retained 'central' access to farm house* – You mention that sight lines would be approximately the same as previously. However, you don't appear to have marked those on any of the amended plans. For the avoidance of doubt, is the farmhouse you refer to Woodgate House that the site wraps around. *Thanks for the clarification of the property name. And yes, it's the sight lines from that retained access that I want to see on a further plan, please.*

With regard to other matters to do with your re-submission contained in your emails of 20 December 2021 and 19 January 2022, I've now gone through this. FYI, I am waiting for my S38/278 engineer to go through the Design Check. I will report his findings as soon as he has responded to me. With regard to other points, please see below that I'd like your responses to, please:

1. *Safety Audit* – Please would you put-together a table setting out the various component parts of the safety audit (i.e. problem, recommendation etc.) and send that to me to add my comments. We will both need to sign and date a FINAL version too. Suggest you firstly complete what you can; I will then add my comments and the 'Agreed Action' and then I'll send that back to you. If you're happy, then send a signed and dated copy to me and I'll sign-off my section once all the design elements have been concluded.
2. *Additional Safety Audit of footway extension and cycle connections* – Hopefully my comments above will help you with further design work and will enable you to commission a Stage 1 for the additional works. I

look forward to receiving this and associated RSA 'log' in due course. This must be done while the application is still 'live' and NOT post-planning, please.

3. *Interaction of site access works with other access points* – This is now demonstrated – thank you.
4. *Interaction of access works with BEW access point* - This is now demonstrated – thank you.
5. *Travel Plan* – I look forward to seeing an updated TP in due course. However, I do agree that FINAL Travel Plan can be agreed post-planning. In accordance with WSCC policy, the TP must be secured by S106 Agreement as must the monitoring fee of £3,500 – NOT planning conditions for either.
6. *Access and sight lines* – Please confirm (and show on a plan) that the access and associated visibility splays and widening works required to deliver the access can be delivered using land in your client's control and/or highway land.
7. *EV parking* – Please be aware that EV parking is due to be covered by building regulations some time later this year. It might be that if the site receives planning permission and reserved matters are sought after the introduction of building regs to cover EV provision, then that might be how the matter is considered. If RM comes in before, then I suspect that current guidance issued by the LPA would be used. The case officer – Mr. Davis – will be able to advise.

I trust the above is helpful to you and I look forward to hearing from you again soon. When replying, please ensure that all information is also copied to Mr. Davis at Arun DC in order that it finds its way to the public file – thank you.

Regards,

Tim

Tim Townsend, MCIHT

Principal Transport Planner, County Highways Team – Highways, Transport and Planning
West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RQ



Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk