

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Michael Eastham
FROM:	Highways, WSCC: Tim Townsend
DATE:	20th August 2018
LOCATION:	Land at, Bridge Cottage & The Old Cottage, Lidsey Road, Bognor Regis, PO22 9PH
SUBJECT:	AL/20/18/OUT Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of 2 No. dwellings & associated outbuildings & the erection of up to 27 No. dwellings, of which 30% will be affordable, with associated open space & access. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan. <u>More information.</u>
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	
RECOMMENDATION:	☐ Advice ☒ Objection ☐ Modification ☐ No Objection ☒ More Information ☐ Refusal
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	£ See below for details.

This is the second WSCC highways and transport response to the above outline planning application with all matters reserved for the demolition of 2 No. dwellings & associated outbuildings & the erection of up to 27 No. dwellings, of which 30% will be affordable, with associated open space & access. This report responds to additional information provided by the applicant and their agents – namely Technical Note produced by Reeves Transport Planning Consultants, reference: TN_SGR_TOC_101117-3_V2 (July 2018).

Summary position of County Highway Authority (CHA).

Based on the information submitted, the CHA continues to object to the proposal on grounds of substandard access design and associated road safety implications **and** lack of suitable sustainable access (i.e. non-motorised access by those on foot, bicycle etc.) to local bus services, employment, schools and goods/services.

Site location.

The site is located adjacent to the A29 Lidsey Road north of Bognor Regis. The applicant seeks to demolish two properties and outbuildings, replacing them with up to 27 dwellings, internal access roads and parking. Access to the site is shown directly off the A29 Lidsey Road on the northern side (outside apex) of a bend in the road. Alongside the first section of the access road (on the southern side), a footway is shown for part of the road's length.

Further comments about access and suitability thereof are made elsewhere in this report.

Access.

As mentioned above, vehicular access is shown directly off the A29 on the apex of a bend in the road. The Applicant's Transport Consultant has confirmed that the proposed access road would measure 4.8m wide with 5.0m bellmouth radii. Visibility splays are taken from a 2.4m 'x' distance with major road ('y') distances of 81m in both directions as shown on 'New Access Design' drawing OCL/SR/701 Rev C. Forward visibility stopping sight distance (SSD) (i.e. that required for drivers of vehicles turning right and left into the site and corresponding visibility for drivers already on Lidsey Road coming-across them – from both north and south) is now shown at 45m. The first 15m of the access road should be constructed as a flat plateau in order to minimise 'rolling-forward' of vehicles towards the A29 when waiting to emerge to it. Alongside this, the A29 itself where it meets the access would need to be carefully designed to minimise chance of grounding of vehicles when entering or leaving the development site. Additionally, comments about surface water drainage are made elsewhere in this report and separately by the County Council's Surface Water Engineer.

In its previous response of 12th June 2018, the CHA requested the following additional information related to the access (other requirements are summarised elsewhere in this report under relevant sections). Comments in black text are the original comments made by the CHA with those in red text being the latest CHA replies to the new information provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant:

- The dimensions of bellmouth radii of new junction. **Now shown at 5.0m. Given the classification of the road (A29) and amount of traffic using it and the need to attempt to contain turning movements for vehicles to avoid over-sailing of the centreline when emerging to Lidsey Road (particularly commercial and refuse vehicles), the Highway Authority recommends that a minimum of 9.0m bellmouth radii be implemented on both sides.**
- The achievable visibility splays taken from 2.4m 'x' distance with dimensions marked-on. **These are now shown and concur with the recorded traffic speeds.**
- The forward visibility both for vehicles travelling north AND south encountering a vehicle waiting to turn into the site with dimensions. **These are now shown at 45m Stopping Sight Distance (SSD). However, in order to establish the correct SSD dimension, the 85th %tile speed recordings should be used as advised in MfS2. Looking at the Transport Statement, speed recordings have only been taken in a single location found south of the proposed access point. As-per guidance, a second location is recommended to be used on the western side of the access (on the approach thereto). However from observation, looking at the characteristics of the road (i.e. curvature, alignment, gradient etc.) and the current readings, on this occasion the single location appears to be representative of the on-site situation for both approaches.**

Northbound approach (south of the proposed point of access) - Based on the recorded AM peak 85th %tile speed of 37mph with a generally level approach on the road (i.e. no gradient), the SSD should be 67m.

Eastbound approach (west of the proposed point of access) - Based on the recorded AM peak 85th %tile speed of 38mph with a slight gradient down towards the access, the SSD should be 68m.

Given the above, the applicants should provide a further plan to demonstrate that these SSD splays can be achieved using land within their control or land within the public highway.

It is not clear from the current plan (OCL/SR/701 Rev. C) what the red colouring is supposed to show. As such, a plan showing what the County Council currently consider to be the extent of public highway is attached to this reply in order to assist the applicant when plotting the visibility and SSD splays.

- Dimensions of carriageway at and on the approach to the site entrance (and site entrance itself). **Now shown on Drawing No. OCL/SR/701.**

With regard to design documentation used to inform the road and access design, the applicant's Transport Consultant has used advice in Manual for Streets 2 (MfS2) to inform parameters (visibility, access widths etc.), whereas Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) is generally used where the speed limit exceeds MfS2 criteria of 37mph. The A29 at this location is 50mph. However, in support of using MfS2, the applicant's Transport Consultant has provided speed and traffic count data recorded over the period 15th March – 26th March 2016. The data is just over 2 years old but with regard to solely the speed data, no material changes have taken place since this time to suggest speeds might have increased or decreased. However (and as documented above), only a single location was used to record traffic speeds (south of the proposed point of access). However, for the reasons given above, the single location is considered representative on this occasion.

In its previous response of 12th June 2018, the CHA requested the following additional information in order to be able to consider this part of the proposal further. Comments in black text are the original comments made by the CHA with those in red text being the latest CHA replies to the new information provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant:

- Plan showing precise locations of where the speed surveys were taken/recorded. **Now shown.**
- Details of weather conditions during entire extent of surveys. **Now provided.**
- The position of the right-turning vehicle (car) could – in practice – vary and as such, should also be shown further north and with SSD visibility splays plotted. **This hasn't been shown in the original or revised drawings. As such, the applicant should provide two plots of the right-turning vehicle - one where it is at present and the other with it slightly further forward with the SSD splays plotted with dimensions (see comments about distances made earlier in this report).**

The data provided so far shows the following (85thtile speeds are quoted):

Northbound.

AM peak – 37mph

PM peak – 35mph

Southbound.

AM peak – 38mph

PM peak – 36mph

Although detailed surface water drainage (SWD) comments will be made separately by the SWD team, at any detailed design/S278 stage careful attention should be given by the applicant to SWD on the bend in the road adjacent to the access, particularly as water occasionally ponds at this location. As the applicant is proposing road widening here, the amount of hard area (i.e. road surface) will be increasing, thereby increasing surface water run-off. As such, any highway works here should include appropriate mitigation to address this.

Previously, the applicant was asked to provide detail of the proposed road markings at the new access and on the road itself, documenting how these comply with the Traffic Signs Manual. **Double white lines are shown as existing – the only difference now being that the carriageway at the bend is widened.**

- Also previously, a design commentary was requested. **Drawing OCL/SR/701 Rev. C attempts to show design parameters taken from MfS2. Although please note that it will need updating in-light of the SSD comments made earlier.**

In its previous response of 12th June 2018, the CHA requested the following additional information in order to be able to consider this part of the proposal further. Comments in black text are the original comments made by the CHA with those in red text being the latest CHA replies to the new information provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant:

- Visibility information and SSD to right turning vehicles as required as above. **Amended plan to be provided showing extended splays as referred to previously in this report.**
- Vegetation areas required for visibility purposes shown more clearly. **A plan has been provided by the applicant but it is not clear whether it is correctly showing that requested. The applicant should re-visit this alongside the attached highway boundary plan and provide an accurate drawing with suitable annotation.**
- Road markings that are proposed at and on the approaches to the new access point and how these comply with the Traffic Signs Manual. **Road markings shown as double white lines (no overtaking etc.).**
- A Design Commentary setting-out how the design complies with guidance and/or design standards. **Drawing OCL/SR/701 Rev. C attempts to show design parameters taken from MfS2. Although please note that it will need updating in-light of the SSD comments made earlier.**

A revised plan should be prepared and submitted to the LPA and CHA to consider further. However, based on that provided so far, a highway objection continues to be raised.

Road Safety.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been provided within the Transport Statement (TS) that accompanies the application. A Designer's Response (DR) is also provided.

The audit team makes three recommendations based on correspondence from Reeves Transport Planning and specifically Drawing No. LID/SR/101 - all to do with the access position and visibility available to and from it. The designer accepts these although in the absence of revised plans showing adequate Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) (see comments above), it is not possible to comment further at this stage. It is also relevant that the RSA was based on a previous proposal for 6-7 units – not the 27 now proposed.

The footpath towards the south-bound bus stop on Lidsey Road previously shown on an earlier version of the site layout, has now been deleted from the application.

In its previous response of 12th June 2018, the CHA requested the following additional information in order to be able to consider this part of the proposal further. Comments in black text are the original comments made by the CHA with those in red text being the latest CHA replies to the new information provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant:

- Any revised plan/s (when produced) - including description of development as submitted under AL/20/18/OUT - to be submitted to the audit team for further comments. Following that, both the plan and any further comments from the Audit Team to be provided to the CHA to consider. **This has not been done. As well as that requested above, the audit team should also be asked for comments in response to the suitability of the footway access shown provided on the southern side of the bellmouth.**
- The footpath leading towards the bus stop should be safety audited. **Path now deleted.**
- Any additional highways mitigation - if proposed and/or identified to be safety audited. **None offered at this moment in time.**

Personal Injury Accident (PIA) reports have been provided for the period 01/03/2011 – 29/02/2016. Plan dated 08/04/2016 provided by the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership shows that during this time 6 PIAs were recorded. 4 of these resulted in slight injury; 1 in serious injury and 1 fatal. Of these, 1 slight and 1 serious were recorded close to the location of the proposed site access. However, further records up-to the current date (or as records permit) were requested in the previous report. These have now been provided.

In its previous response of 12th June 2018, the CHA requested the following additional information in order to be able to consider this part of the proposal further. Comments in black text are the original comments made by the CHA with those in red text being the latest CHA replies to the new information provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant:

- Up-to-date PIA records for the most-recent 5 years. The records provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant only provide data up-to 2016. All the information will be reviewed by the CHA when that information is made available. **Now provided.**

Traffic generation.

The site, as existing, has two residential properties on it (including outbuildings). The proposal seeks to demolish these and construct up to 27 homes. The TS includes TRICS data provided by the applicant's Transport Consultant suggesting that the site – in redeveloped guise – would generate the following trips, showing AM and PM* peak periods and daily traffic:

Table 5.1
TRICS Data and Development Trip Generation Analysis

Time Range	TRICS Data		Development Trip Generation	
	Arrivals	Departures	Arrivals	Departures
AM Peak Hr (08:00 to 09:00)	0.126	0.411	3.4	11.1
PM Peak Hr (08:00 to 09:00)	0.398	0.254	10.7	6.9
12Hour (07:00 to 19:00)	2.809	2.881	75.8	77.8

(*Note that the table erroneously mis-quotes the AM hours for the PM peak period – these should read 17:00-18:00).

Sustainable access.

Walking – The proposed indicative layout shows a combination of footways and shared-surface arrangements. A single footway is shown emerging on the southern side of the vehicular access, terminating just beyond the cessation of the bellmouth onto the A29. However, the applicant does not demonstrate how safe pedestrian access is provided to-and-from the site – particularly as this path does not connect to any other paths/footways close-by. No other footways are close-by (the nearest appearing to be opposite the Robin Hood Public House found 500-600m south of the site). There are Public Rights of Way nearby, in the form of Public Footpath's No. 200_1 running E-W and utilising the course of the disused canal; 296_1 that runs N-S from 200_1 to Sack Lane (found south of the site); 151 found south of Sack Lane and 152 that can be found at the eastern end of Sack Lane. However, these paths are generally indirect and predominantly serve as leisure routes given their location, construction, width and lack of lighting, thereby giving only very limited potential for commuter/access to employment, shopping and school-based trips.

Cycling – No bespoke off-road routes are available for cyclists, requiring them to use the A29 providing access for those likely to be confident and/or experienced riders only.

Buses – The current bus service is documented in the TS. Bus stops are located within verges approximately at and opposite the entrance to Lidsey Caravan Park. However, there are currently no footways or footpaths providing access to them (nor hardstandings by them

either) requiring users to either walk in the carriageway of the A29 or be dropped-off adjacent to them.

Train – The nearest railway stations are Bognor Regis and Barnham. Public Footpath 200_1 does provide an indirect link to the latter on-foot only. However, given the suitability of the route and distance of both stations from the site and lack of other walking and cycling routes, access to both would likely be by car.

Internal layout.

The internal layout is shown indicatively on drawing 1749-02G. As submitted, it is not clear whether it would be suitable for adoption under S38. This would be a matter to be looked-at at any Discharge Of Condition (DOC) or Reserved Matters (REM) staged. Also, it is not known what form of surface water drainage is proposed for the site which might itself dictate whether the layout can or can't be adopted.

With regard to access by refuse and fire appliances, the access drive shown to plots 22-27 might need widening as in places it looks slightly restrictive (particularly adjacent to plots 25-27). As such, this would have to be considered further at any RES/DOC stage.

As part of any permission, a suitable S106 Agreement would be required to secure any off-site highways works (if required) and additionally, must also include a non-adoption clause to safeguard the County Council if the internal layout is not offered for adoption and similarly, a management plan clause to secure an appropriate management company for the long-term maintenance of any highways infrastructure remaining private.

Parking.

Parking should follow WSCC parking guidance. The TS does provide a copy of the WSCC Parking Calculator suggesting that 61 spaces are required for the 27 homes proposed. This and the layout of car parking (including visitor car parking) will be looked at in detail at any reserved matters/discharge of conditions stage. Parking space dimensions shall follow advice in MfS – so car parking spaces to be 2.4m wide x 4.8m long (3.0m wide if located alongside walls/barriers etc. and 6.0m long if located in front of garages). Garage dimensions (internal) to be 3.0m wide x 6.0m long.

Street lighting.

Street lighting should be considered for the layout. However, this is a matter to be considered at any discharge of condition (DOC) and/or reserved matters (RES) application stage. Careful consideration should also be given to the junction with the A29 (and its approaches) given that the location is unlit. Also and depending on any off-site mitigation offered, this too should be considered for lighting.

Strategic Location (Emerging Arun Local Plan).

Reference is made within the TS about the Barnham-Eastergate-Westergate (BEW) Strategic Allocation site for housing found north and east of the application site. However, the application site itself does not appear to be included within the allocation. Based on the current indicative alignment of the proposed southern connection of the new A29, the site does not appear to prejudice this. However, in advance of appropriate highways infrastructure which might include that which the new road might bring such as new roads, footways and cycle-ways to local services, employment, schools etc., the submission of the site now for development might be considered premature at this stage. While the subject of prematurity is a matter for the LPA to consider, the aforementioned lack of suitable vehicular access and sustainable non-motorised access is still relevant at this stage given the shortcomings as documented above and does still contribute to the prematurity statement.

S106 (non-highways).

A detailed S106 consultation response is provided at the foot of this report. Comments refer to local County Council services in order to ensure any proposed development would be

appropriately mitigated in terms of infrastructure provision and/or contributions. These services include highways, education (Early Years, Primary, Secondary, Sixth Form and Special Education Needs), libraries, waste and Fire Service and delivery solutions for these projects need to be agreed. Also, the installation of and connection to mains water fire hydrants are required at the developer's expense - these will be conditioned as necessary. Additionally, a contribution towards transport infrastructure to assist with delivery of the BEW Strategic Allocation would also be required.

Conclusion.

As submitted, both the design of the access and provision of access by non-car modes are not adequately demonstrated. As such, the CHA continues to object to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. Adequate information has not been submitted to satisfy the Highway Authority that the proposal is acceptable in terms of road/junction layout and visibility splays (including forward visibility/stopping sight distance splays) and would therefore give rise to increased hazards to highway users.
2. The proposal does not provide safe and convenient access to goods, services, schools and employment by a choice of means of travel nor does it encourage and enable an increase in environmentally sustainable means of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL

**PLANNING SERVICES DIVISION: SECTION 106 CONSULTATION RESPONSE
(excluding Transport (known as TAD) contributions)**

DATE: 9th July 2018

FROM: Eloise Short, Monitoring and Records Team

TO: Tim Townsend, Planning Applications Team

DISTRICT COUNCIL: Arun

Application Number: AL/20/18

The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to: Land at Bridge Cottage & The Old Cottage Lidsey Road Lidsey PO22 9PH

Planning Application details – Outline application with all matters reserved for the demolition of 2 No. dwellings & associated outbuildings & the erection of up to 27 No. dwellings, of which 30% will be affordable, with associated open space & access. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan.

Without prejudice to the informal representations of the County Council in respect of the above planning proposal, I am writing to advise you as to the likely requirements for contributions towards the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, other than highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

The basis for my advice is contained in the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document "The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1.

The planning obligation formulae below are understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined by the in the *National Planning Policy Framework, 2012*.

The advice is as follows:

1. School Infrastructure Contribution

1.1 The Director for Children and Young People's Services advises that it appears that at present primary/secondary/further secondary schools within the catchment area of the proposal currently would not have spare capacity and would not be able to accommodate the children generated by the assumed potential residential development from this proposal. Accordingly, contributions would need to be requested.

1.2 Early Years, Primary and Secondary Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the county council would be based on: the provision of two 2FE primary schools, the provision of 110 nursery places and a new 10FE

secondary school to serve Arun District, as set out in the Arun Infrastructure Delivery Plan (February 2018).

We will require £30,933 towards fixtures, fittings and equipment towards a new early years facility serving BEW, based on the provision of 27 dwellings.

We will require £194,870 towards fixtures, fittings and equipment for a new primary school serving BEW, based on the provision of 27 dwellings.

We will require £118,692 towards fixtures, fittings and equipment for a new secondary school serving Arun, based on the provision of 27 dwellings.

1.3 Further Secondary Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development, reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings (by which we mean Social Rented dwellings, but NOT Shared Equity, Intermediate or Key Worker status dwellings) for occupation by persons already residing in the education catchment area; the County Council's adopted floorspace standard for education provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional education floorspace. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal Agreement in order that the school infrastructure contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the School Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

$\text{DfE Figure} \times \text{ACP} = \text{School Infrastructure Contribution}$ where:

Note: x = multiplied by.

ACP (Additional Child Product) = The estimated additional number of school age children likely to be generated by the development calculated by reference to the total number of dwellings, less any allowance for affordable dwellings, as approved by a subsequent reserve matters planning application. The following criteria are used to generate a child product:

Dwelling Size		Occupancy	
		House	Flat
1 bed	=	1.5	1.3
2 bed	=	1.9	1.9
3 bed	=	2.5	2.4
4+ bed	=	3.0	2.8

Using the above occupancy rates to determine an overall population increase the following factors are applied. According to 2001 census data, there are 14 persons per 1000 population in each school year group for houses and 5 persons per 1000 population in each school year group for flats. There are 7 year groups for primary (years R to 6) and 5 for secondary (years 7 to 11). For Sixth Form, a factor of 0.54 is applied to the Child Product figure as this is the average percentage of year 11 school leavers who continue into Sixth Form colleges in West Sussex.

DfE Figure = Department for Education (DfE) school building costs per pupil place (for pupils aged 4 to 16) as adjusted for the West Sussex area applicable at the date when the School Infrastructure Contribution is paid (which currently for the financial year 2018/2019 are – Primary £17,920, Secondary £27,000, Further Secondary £29,283), updated as necessary by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors Building Cost Information Service All-In Tender Price Index.

- 1.3 The contributions generated by this proposal shall be spent on additional facilities at St Phillip Howard Catholic High School Sixth Form.

2. Library Infrastructure Contribution

- 2.1 The County Librarian advises that the proposed development would be within the area served by a proposed Tier 7 library for BEW and that the library would not currently be able to adequately serve the additional needs that the development would generate.

However, a scheme is approved to provide additional floorspace or facilities at the library. In the circumstances, a financial contribution towards the approved scheme would be required in respect of the extra demands for library services that would be generated by the proposed development.

2.2 Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council will be based on: the housing allocation at BEW providing a Tier 7 facility at a cost of £100,000. A pro-rata share of this cost will be divided between developments at BEW, based on dwelling numbers.

We will require £1,173 towards a new Tier 7 facility for BEW, based on the provision of 27 dwellings.

3. Fire & Rescue Service Infrastructure

3.1 Fire Stations

The County Fire Officer advises that a financial contribution from the proposed development towards the cost of fire and rescue infrastructure, principally fire stations and services serving the area within which the proposal stands, would be required. This is necessary due to proposed development in the Southern division and the resultant need to improve service provision across the area. The proposed development should proportionately contribute towards the cost of necessary infrastructure needed to support development.

3.2 Financial Contribution (excluding provision of fire hydrants)

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development, reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings (by which we mean Social Rented dwellings, but NOT Shared Equity, Intermediate or Key Worker status dwellings) for occupation by persons already residing in the fire service provision area; the County Council's adopted standards of fire service cover provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional fire stations. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal Agreement in order that the fire service contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the Fire and Rescue Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

$Y \times (Z / M)$ = Fire and Rescue Infrastructure Contribution where:

Note: / = divided by, x = multiplied by.

Y = The estimated adjusted increase in population generated by the development using the following figures as a guideline:

Dwelling Size		Occupancy	
		House	Flat
1 bed	=	1.5	1.3
2 bed	=	1.9	1.9
3 bed	=	2.5	2.4
4+ bed	=	3.0	2.8

Z = the estimated costs of providing additional Fire and Rescue Infrastructure in the Southern Service Division of West Sussex at the time of payment (which, for information, for 2007/2008 was £5,530,000).

M = the projected population of the Fire and Rescue Service Southern Service Division of West Sussex in 2016 at the time of payment (which, for information, for the 2007/2008 financial year was 429,647).

3.3 Fire and Rescue Service Contribution to be used towards supply and installation of additional fire safety equipment to vulnerable persons homes in West Sussex Fire Rescue Services Southern Area serving Aldingbourne.

General points

Please ensure that the applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, either size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the housing mix is known and not be left until signing of the section 106 Agreement is imminent.

It should be noted that the figures quoted in this letter are based on current information and will be adhered to for 3 months. Thereafter, if they are not consolidated in a signed S106 agreement they will be subject to revision as necessary to reflect the latest information as to cost and need.

Review of the contribution towards the provision of additional County Council services should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Appropriate occupancy rates using the latest available Census data will be used.

Should you require further general information or assistance in relation to the requirements for contributions towards the provision of County Council service infrastructure please contact, in the first instance, the Planning Applications Team officer, named above.

Where the developer intends to keep some of the estate roads private we will require provisions in any s106 agreement to ensure that they are properly built, never offered for adoption and that a certificate from a suitably qualified professional is provided confirming their construction standard.

Where land is to be transferred to the County Council as part of the development (e.g. a school site) that we will require the developer to provide CAD drawings of the site to aid design/layout and to ensure that there is no accidental encroachment by either the developer or ourselves.