

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Simon Davis
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	19 May 2021
LOCATION:	Land At Wings Nursery Lidsey Road Woodgate PO20 3SU
SUBJECT:	AL/20/21/PL Demolition of Wings House & erection of 71 No. replacement dwellings (70 net new dwellings), access arrangements, sustainable drainage measures, public open space, landscaping & all other associated works (resubmission following AL/46/20/PL). This application is a Departure from the Development Plan. New Technical Note received.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a (visited as part of the assessment undertaken for previous proposals AL/117/17/OUT, AL/32/19/OUT and AL/46/20/PL).
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required/Modification Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	TBA

This is the second WSCC Highways (CHA) response to the above planning application for demolition of Wings House & erection of 71 No. replacement dwellings (70 net new dwellings), access arrangements, sustainable drainage measures, public open space, landscaping & all other associated works (resubmission following AL/46/20/PL).

In 2017, 2019 and 2020, the CHA was consulted for comments in response to three previous planning applications for residential development on the site under Arun District Planning references AL/117/17/OUT, AL/32/19/OUT and AL/46/20/PL. The first two were for 55 dwellings whereas the last one was for 81 units.

This response follows consideration of latest Technical Note produced by Bright Plan Transport Consultants dated 16th April 2021 sent directly to the CHA. Comments below should be read alongside the CHA's previous response dated 26th February 2021.

Summary of previously requested additional information.

The following additional information was previously requested in order that the CHA can consider the proposal further (*red italic text alongside are latest CHA comments*):

1. Tracking diagram for a refuse vehicle adjacent to plots 63 and 64. *The reply from the consultants says that refuse collection for these units would be undertaken from Lidsey Road as per existing properties in the locale. They consider that bin carry-distances for refuse collectors and residents are compliant with Manual for*

Streets as demonstrated in Drawing 2020-6115-008. While this might be the case, in practice the refuse contractor might choose to enter the access 'road' serving those houses. Therefore, the case officer should check with the provider to establish what their method of operation would be.

2. **Tracking for a selection of vehicles travelling north-bounds negotiating a stationary bus in the re-located bus stop north of the primary access.** *A vehicle swept path analysis has been undertaken demonstrating a variety of vehicle classes negotiating a stationary bus in Drawing 2020-6115-013. This shows that vehicles negotiating a stationary bus would be required to enter the turning lane for the development and in the opposing direction of travel. This has also been picked-up in the Road Safety Audit that also accompanies the re-submission. The consultant has said that the bus stop position has been moved as far north as possible given the presence of trees on the site frontage. However, it still relies on vehicles passing it having to enter the turning lane bringing the risk of head-on vehicular conflict. As such, the position should be reviewed again to remove the identified problem.*
3. **Evidence of correspondence with Road Safety Audit to do with proposed re-location of north-bound bus stop location.** *Please see comments under 2 above.*
4. **Road Safety Audit Log in tabular form and in WORD format.** *Comments in response to the Safety Audit are found below:*
 - a. **Problem 3.1.1 – Risk of head-on collisions with vehicles trying to pass stationary bus** – *Please see comments in 2 above.*
 - b. **Problem 3.1.2 – Long length of right-hand turning lane and risk of overtaking leading to collisions** – *The designer has reviewed this and considers that it would be unnecessary to provide a refuge island along this stretch given that the extension to the turning lane is very short.*
 - c. **Problem 3.4.1 – Overhanging trees and risk of facial injuries to pedestrians** – *A note has been added to the drawings to state that the overhanging trees will be lopped to avoid this happening.*
 - d. **Problem 3.4.2 – Concerns over ditch and whether users might fall in** – *The designer should discuss the reply given with the Safety Audit Team to establish whether it is satisfactory.*
 - e. **Problem 3.4.3 – Concerns over location of gullies in main access possibly coinciding with pedestrian desire line** – *The gullies have now been moved (will be checked again at detailed design stage).*
 - f. **Problem 3.5.1 – Provision of temporary signs to warn drivers of proposed road changes** – *The temporary signs have now been shown (will be checked again at detailed design stage).*

A copy of the Road Safety Audit Log will be provided separately for the designer to add comments when available. A copy in WORD format has been requested directly from the applicant's transport consultants.

5. **Most up-to-date PIA records for the last 5-years.** *This has now been provided and shows three personal injury accidents have occurred in the vicinity of the site during the latest 5 years of records interrogated. One of these occurred at the junction of the A29 with the access road serving Willows Caravan Park (classed as 'slight') and the other two north of the site at the junction of the A29 and Hook*

Lane resulting (one being classed as 'slight' and the other as 'serious'). While any accident is regrettable, the applicant has demonstrated that the accident record along this stretch of A29 is low.

6. Updated Travel Plan with confirmation that an experienced external consultant would be appointed in the role of Travel Plan Coordinator (TPC). And confirmation that provision of a Personal Journey Planning service will be provided to all residents of the development by the TPC. *The matter of the TPC still requires reply. However, the second point – reference to personal journey planning service – is included.*
7. Replies to all bullet points under sub-heading 'internal layout and parking'. *Please see below (previous comments in black text):*
 - Turning for a refuse vehicle is not demonstrated adjacent to plots 63 and 64. *See comments under point 1 above.* Furthermore, another area of concern is the width of the access road serving plots 5-10. This appears to be 4.1m wide which is easily blocked if a vehicle were to park on it. This should be widened to a minimum of 4.8m wide. *This is still shown measuring 4.1m wide. For accessibility reasons and to avoid possible blockage, it should be widened to 4.8m.*
 - Given the lack of service margins and location of some of the parking immediately adjacent to parts of the internal roadways, the layout would not be suitable for adoption under S38 in its current guise. *The consultant has confirmed that the development's access roads are not to be offered for adoption. Should planning permission be granted for the proposal, clauses should be included in the accompanying S106 Agreement to prevent future adoption and to ensure ongoing maintenance of the roads by a management company.*
 - Parts of the layout give a 'mixed message' with regard to user priority etc. particularly where only a single footway is provided and then terminates before what appears to be a shared-surface area. This needs to be shown better-defined (one example being by plots 38 and 48). A coloured site plan should be submitted showing improved definition of how all the different parts of the on-street hierarchy fit-together. *Drawing No. 2020-6115-016 shows that the layout still provides footways for many parts of the development on one side of the internal roads only. While the footway routes do appear to demonstrate some logic with regard to access to the plots they are intended to serve, for shared surface areas a rumble strip or similar should be provided at the start of such areas to provide audible warning to users as they enter them. However, careful attention should be paid to the design of these in order that they are appropriate for use by users who are mobility impaired.*
 - A large number of the parking spaces appear to be narrow with a number in confined spaces. This will make them difficult to use and un-attractive to users, resulting in parking on-street. As such, all parking design should be re-visited with regard to sizing/dimensions. Single spaces with no obstructions either-side – should measure 2.4m wide and 5.5m long. Where driveways are 'shared' (so household spaces next to one-another), driveways should be 6.0m wide. If spaces are to be bounded by obstructions (e.g. walls, fences etc.), single spaces should be widened to at least 3.5 wide and dual spaces to 7.0m wide. Where garages are to be used, these should have internal measurements of 6m x 3m. Access to the parking spaces for plot 43 is very restricted. Enlarging the end of the adjacent access road would assist with improving this. *This matter is still unresolved – further information required.*
 - Tactile paving will be required within the layout at junctions and where paths are located opposite one-another (not fully shown throughout the layout). *This is now shown on Drawing No. 2020-6115-000.*
 - A form of access protection barrier will be required at either-end of the proposed path that leads from the access road serving plots 63-71 to the A29 (the path emerges opposite plot 64). *This is shown on Drawing 2020-6115-000.*

8. Provision of red boundary edging to include all on and off-site transport mitigation proposals. *This is now shown on Drawing No. 2019-6115-015 Rev. A.*

Conclusion.

Additional information is required to enable the CHA to consider the proposal further. Full details of what is required is set-out in the text above. However, a summary of it is found below:

1. *Refuse collection for private driveway* – further information about how refuse would be collected (evidence required from refuse contractor)
2. *Position of northbound bus stop* – further consideration of position of this in-light of Safety Audit concerns
3. *Road Safety Audit* – further replies to points requiring replies as raised above. And for the RSA Log, a WORD-format version required, please.
4. *Travel Plan* – Confirmation that an experienced external consultant will be used to be confirmed.
5. *Access roadway serving plots 5-10* - to be widened to 4.8m
6. *Shared surface sections* – rumble strips (or similar) to be added to the start of all shared surface areas
7. *Parking areas (+ dimensions of spaces)* – Further information and modifications required.

Please re-consult when the additional information set-out above is available, at which time the CHA will consider the proposal further – thank you.

For expediency, a copy of this response has also been sent directly to the Transport Consultant.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services