

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Michael Eastham
FROM:	Highways, WSCC: Tim Townsend
DATE:	15 th November 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>Further information.</u>
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	
RECOMMENDATION:	☐ Advice ☒ Objection ☐ Modification ☐ No Objection ☐ More Information ☐ Refusal
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	£7,196 per-dwelling towards infrastructure for the BEW Strategic Allocation. Requirements for non-highways infrastructure given at foot of this report.

This is the fourth WSCC highways and transport (CHA) 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 Planning Agent Clare Bartlett to Michael Eastham (Arun DC – LPA) in email dated 22nd October 2018 (subsequently passed to the CHA - also on 22nd October 2018).

Comments below should be read alongside the previous CHA reports dated 12th June 2018, 20th August 2018 and 1st October 2018.

Summary position of County Highway Authority (CHA).

Based on the information submitted, the CHA objects to the proposal on grounds of substandard access design and associated road safety implications **and** lack of safe and suitable access for non-motorised users.

Response to latest information.

Drawing 1749-02H (illustrative Site Plan) shows that the footway originally shown to the south of the junction has now been removed from the scheme. So too has the footpath further south. However, drawing DWG 1749-02H is a more detailed drawing from that submitted previously and also shows a number of visibility dimensions - namely actual site access visibility and forward/Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) visibility. Alongside this, road width dimensions appear to be shown. However, as this plan shows more detail over that of

previous drawing OCL/SR/701 revision 'D', it now highlights that the lane widths on the bend adjacent to the site access appear to vary in width, whereas on previous drawings this did not appear to be the case. As the matter of access is a detailed consideration of the planning application, there is a requirement on the applicant to show adequate detail at this current planning stage.

With regard to what is shown, approximately 10m south of the proposed centreline of the new access, the southbound lane width appears to be 2.5m wide. Given that the A29 in this location carries a high proportion of HGVs, concern is expressed that vehicles (HGV or otherwise) might over-sail the centreline when travelling south. As such the applicant must demonstrate that all vehicles using this route will be able to do so without over-sailing the centreline of the A29. Tracking diagrams should be provided and alongside this, the applicant should re-visit the design and alignment of the road (including centreline markings) at this point and provide further drawings. Visibility splays should then be re-marked based on any revised alignment resulting from the tracking and re-marking work required. If these are made available, the CHA will review them.

With regard to bellmouth radii (again based on drawing DWG 1749-02H), it is unclear what is proposed because the dimensions, kerb lines shown do not appear to tally with one-another and are generally unclear on the drawing. As such, the applicant should make it clear where kerb lines are proposed.

Again with regard to visibility splays (site access, forward visibility etc.), these will all need to be reviewed in-light of the comments made above about road alignment. Specifically with regard to the site access visibility in the trailing traffic direction (so looking south from the proposed access), this needs to be shown correctly. It currently crosses the centreline of the Shripney Road meaning that some vehicles could be 'lost' outside of the splay area.

Given the concerns expressed above based on that shown on DWG 1749-02H, the CHA recommends that an objection based on substandard access design be reinstated (and that it sits-alongside the other highway objection already made based on sustainable access):

"Adequate information has not been submitted to satisfy the Highway Authority that the proposal is acceptable in terms of road/junction layout, carriageway (and lane) width/s and visibility splays (including forward visibility/stopping sight distance splays) and would therefore give rise to increased hazards to highway users contrary to the NPPF and adopted Local Plan policies."

In relation to the CHA's previous comments about the Barnham-Eastergate-Westergate Strategic Location (BEW), these were based on the application site not lying within the BEW strategic allocation. The applicant has said that this is incorrect and states that the majority of the site does lie within the allocation. They go on to say that the NPPF provides support for smaller sites such as this which form part of wider strategic sites coming forward early to speed up the delivery of homes (paragraph 68) and so envisage that such sites would be being brought forward in advance of the infrastructure associated with the wider strategic site.

The CHA has, in response to this, viewed MAP 2 (Arundel, the Six Villages and Surrounding Area) contained within the recently adopted Arun Local Plan. This does show that **part** of the site does fall within the Barnham-Eastergate-Westergate (BEW) Strategic Location. This was not clear from previous correspondence provided by the applicant.

With regard to the points made by the applicant about the NPPF, paragraph 68 of the NPPF makes reference to the following (i.e. local planning authorities should...etc.):

***(c)** support development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits is using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes; and*

***(d)** working with developers to encourage sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed-up the delivery of homes.*

From the CHA's point of view, it still considers that the site is not suitable in its current form given lack of suitable vehicular access design and lack of safe and sustainable access arrangements for non-motorised users.

The matter of whether the site can be considered as being within existing settlements for homes or whether sub-dividing larger sites to speed-up delivery of homes are points for the LPA to respond to.

With regard to the site's connectivity with footpaths, the applicant maintains that the existing footway connections will enable those residents that wish to access facilities on foot to be able to do so. They consider that prospective purchasers of the houses will be aware of the accessibility options and such considerations will be factored in to their choices. As documented in its previous responses, the CHA considers that the Public Footpaths predominantly serve only as leisure routes given their location, construction, width, indirectness to main facilities/services etc. and lack of lighting, thereby giving only very limited potential for non-motorised and sustainable access to employment, shopping and school-based trips. Prospective purchasers should be provided with a range of high-quality accessibility options. On this occasion they are not.

Continuing on the subject of sustainable access, the applicant has also stated that the NPPF notes that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in decision-making. They say that this stems from the Matthew Taylor review and subsequent Government responses which have held and confirmed that rural areas should not be penalised from accommodating new development purely because of travel considerations when there may be other broader 'sustainability' benefits to such more rural locations. They conclude that in this instance, the walking and cycling offer will only improve once the full package of transport infrastructure is provided as part of the wider BEW site.

The CHA recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural sites and this has been taken into account by the CHA when considering this site. However, the ability to travel by such means and safely is not demonstrated for this site for the reasons already given. Yes, a fuller package of transport infrastructure is likely to follow as part of the wider BEW site. However, that is something that is not available yet, nor is it offered by the current planning application. As such, prospective residents will remain disadvantaged with the current poor offer for an unknown period of time.

In an attempt to add to the sustainable package offered by the applicants so far, they have said that they would be agreeable to offering a package of measures to residents of the scheme to promote the use of alternative methods of transport. Such a package could include:

- Electric charging points for every house
- Electric charging points in the street for delivery drivers and visitors
- Cycle vouchers
- Promotional literature on walking routes

The CHA considers that all the above would be welcomed and indeed, in the case of points 3 and 4, would be expected as part of any Travel Plan. However, it does not change the fact that the site still provides only limited opportunities for sustainable travel to-and-from it – particularly walking and access to services, facilities and public transport etc. and as such, does not alter the CHA's view of the proposal from a sustainability viewpoint.

In addition, the applicant has also mentioned that the use of a car club, such as Co-Wheels which uses electric, low emission and hybrid cars, could also be considered although the size of the site may make this an unsuitable candidate.

Again, although this would be welcomed, the applicants are likely correct in this assumption that one wouldn't be feasible given the size and location of the site.

The applicants conclude that the scheme presents the opportunity to improve highway safety on the A29 for all road users. This coupled with the early delivery of both affordable and open market housing is considered to be significant factors that weigh in favour of granting planning permission.

The CHA disagrees with the highway elements of this statement, concluding that the proposed access shown connecting to the public highway does not demonstrate a highway safety improvement and that – and lack of suitable sustainable access – currently presents potential risks to highway users. On this occasion, new access is necessary to serve the site and any design should follow recognised guidance and/or standards to ensure that highway safety is not compromised at the point it is proposed. Likewise, suitable and safe sustainable access is required. Neither is currently demonstrated to the satisfaction of the CHA.

With regard to the comment about early delivery of housing, this is a matter for the LPA to consider.

Conclusion.

As submitted, both the design of the access **and** provision of access by non-car modes is not adequately demonstrated. As such, the CHA objects 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, carriageway (and lane) width/s and visibility splays (including forward visibility/stopping sight distance splays) and would therefore give rise to increased hazards to highway users contrary to the NPPF and adopted Local Plan policies.
2. The proposal does not provide safe nor convenient infrastructure for non-car access to-and-from goods, services, local facilities, schools and employment, nor does it encourage or enable an increase in environmentally sustainable means of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport contrary to the NPPF and adopted Local Plan policies.

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:-

DfE Figure x ACP = 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:-

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

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.