

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Leanne Richardson
FROM:	WSCC – Highway Authority
DATE:	19 September 2024
LOCATION:	Land at Woodgate Nurseries Lidsey Road Woodgate
SUBJECT:	AL/89/24/OUT Outline planning with all matters reserved (except access) for the demolition of existing redundant nursery buildings and other structures and erection of a residential development of with up to 130 No dwellings, informal and formal public open space, landscaping, drainage, and other associated works. This application may be a Departure from the Development Plan.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	12 September 2024
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required

This is the WSCC Highways response to an outline planning with all matters reserved (except access) for the demolition of existing redundant nursery buildings and other structures and erection of a residential development of with up to 130 No dwellings, informal and formal public open space, landscaping, drainage, and other associated works.

Site location and proposed means of access.

Vehicular access to the site will be via an internal spine road provided as part of a planning consent approved under Arun District Planning reference AL/70/23/OUT. The access to the A29 Lidsey Road incorporated a bellmouth junction with ghosted island right turn lane with the A29 Lidsey Road that was also approved as part of the earlier AL/129/21/OUT consent. An additional access for pedestrians and cyclists is also proposed, taken directly from the A29 to the northeast of the site. Further comments about this will be made elsewhere in this response.

Access on foot, bicycle and public transport.

Walking and cycling - The access arrangement granted planning permission as part of AL/129/21/OUT includes a footway connection to the existing footway along the western side of the A29 Lidsey Road to connect with the existing shared footway/cycle path to the north. This shared path continues north towards Woodgate. The approved access arrangement was also included in the planning application AL/70/23/OUT.

To the north of the vehicular access, the existing footway along the western side of the A29 Lidsey Road has been widened to 2.0 metres. This was provided as part of the 'Wings Nursery' development for up to 71 new units (ref: AL/20/21/PL and continued under s73 application ref: AL/34/22/PL). Along the site frontage of the Wings Nursery development, part of the footway was also widened to 2.0 metres.

Additionally, the development at 'The Woodgate Centre' for up to 180 residential dwellings to the east of Lidsey Road (ref: AL/107/21/PL) also includes improvements to

the existing footway and cycleway network, and improved connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists across the wider area.

Figure 2.2, found in the Transport Assessment (TA), shows the consented/approved pedestrian and cycle improvements in the locality.

The TA also explains that the strategic Barnham-Eastergate-Westergate (BEW) site (located on the eastern side of the A29 and including 'The Woodgate Centre') will also provide new walking and cycling routes for the wider area, including direct routes to and from Barnham railway station and other local facilities including schools and shops.

The BEW development also includes the diversion of the A29 via a new route. This new route includes segregated and shared-use footways and cycleways and will also reduce the volume of traffic on Lidsey Road within the vicinity of the application site, therefore improving the attractiveness of Lidsey Road for walking and cycling journeys.

Public transport (buses) - The nearest bus stops are located on the A29 Lidsey Road, approximately 90m south of the proposed pedestrian/cycle access.

The bus stops have been upgraded as part of the Wings Nursery application (ref: AL/20/21/PL) to include new shelters, hardstanding and seating.

These bus stops are served by the 66A and 66C bus services which operate between Bognor Regis, Yapton, and Walberton. 66A provides an anti-clockwise service via Yapton and Walberton and 66C provides a clockwise service via Walberton and Yapton; together there are six services which run in each direction on weekdays, with one fewer service towards Bognor on Saturdays and no services on a Sunday.

Railway - Barnham railway station is located approximately 4km (approximately a 12-minute cycle ride) to the east of the site. The station can also be reached via the 66A and 66C buses, taking approximately nine minutes. Cycle parking is available at the station (62 spaces) as is car parking (130 spaces).

Barnham railway station is located on the West Coastway Line between Brighton and Southampton, at the junction of the branch line leading to Bognor Regis. The station also regularly serves London Victoria via Gatwick Airport, Brighton, Southampton, Portsmouth and Littlehampton.

Bognor Regis railway station is located approximately 5.0km to the south of the site which equates to a 16-minute cycle ride using the A29 and other local roads.

Both stations also provide additional infrequent direct services to Bristol Temple Meads, Salisbury and Great Malvern.

Local services and access thereto - Various local facilities are to be found in Woodgate and these are also accessible on foot or by bicycle along the A29 Lidsey Road. Further services can be found in both Westergate and Eastergate to the north and are accessible via footways for the entire route. A selection of these local facilities (including distance thereto) are listed in Table 2.2 found in the TA.

Road safety.

Personal Injury Accidents (PIAs) - Personal Injury Accident (PIA) data for the period January 2018 to December 2022 has been obtained from the Crashmap Pro database for the vicinity of the proposed site, as shown in Figure 2.3 found in the TA. The area examined extends from the War Memorial Roundabout in the north to the Saltbox roundabout in the south, as agreed with WSCC Highways as part of pre-application stage discussions. The PIA output is contained in Appendix 3, also in the TA.

The PIA data shows that there have been 42 PIAs recorded on the highway network in the study area between 2018 and 2022, of which 32 were recorded as 'slight', and ten as 'serious'.

However, as the data provided finishes at 2022, the applicant is requested to try to obtain data post 2022 and if anything later is available, to provide this to the Highway Authority.

Road Safety Audit – WORD-version of Decision Log required so Highway Authority can add its comments. Applicant to provide.

Traffic impact of development on local highway network.

The baseline traffic survey data that supported the consented AL/129/21/OUT and AL/70/23/OUT applications consisted of a 7-day Automatic Traffic Counter survey (ATC) which was carried out on the A29 Lidsey Road. This ATC was carried out from the 21st March 2019 to the 27th March 2019 and was used to assess the capacity of the ghost island right turn lane which forms part of the access proposals for the AL/129/21/OUT planning application.

The applicants have also carried out an updated ATC traffic survey from the 22nd February 2023 to the 28th February 2023. The TA states that the survey parameters, including the location of the ATC are consistent with the previous assessment carried out in 2019, with the results showing comparable levels of traffic to the previous survey.

The results of the survey are summarised in Table 2.3, and the full results are provided as Appendix 4, both in the TA.

The TA explains that the extant use of the site is for a garden nursery and two residential dwellings, taking access from a private access road with Lidsey Road with a dropped kerb crossover junction, approximately 95m south of the nearby railway level crossing. The private access road is approximately 140m in length and measures between 2.7-3.0m wide.

Planning permission (ref: AL/90/13) for a caravan and touring park was granted in February 2014. The proposals included 11 static caravans/lodges and 20 touring/camping pitches, with access taken via the existing access road which was proposed to be widened to 4.1-4.5 metres, with a 6.1 metre wide bellmouth junction with Lidsey Road, including removal of an existing oak tree to the south of the junction.

The Transport Assessment which supported the application set out that the proposed development of 29 holiday lodges and the existing residential dwelling would have resulted in 38 arrivals and 34 departures daily, with up to three vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and seven vehicle movements in the PM peak hour. The TA did not include any capacity modelling of the site access or local highway network. This was because as the application was for a holiday park, the Highway Authority considered that the impact on the local highway network would not be significant due to holiday traffic normally occurring outside of traditional peak hours. No highway objection was raised by the Highway Authority to the proposal.

The Transport Assessment supporting the application for the caravan and touring park set out that the previous nursery and residential uses would have been expected to have attracted 73 arrivals and 92 departures daily, of which circa 126 movement were associated with transit vehicles, LGVs and HGVs with up to 13 vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 23 vehicle movements in the PM peak hour.

The proposed development, the subject of this current planning application, will result in the access road being closed to vehicular access, instead providing a connection from

the site for pedestrians and cyclists and emergency purposes. However, further detail of this, including its connection with the existing A29 and how such works interface with off-site foot and cycle highway improvements proposed as part of the nearby Woodgate Centre scheme, should be provided.

Subject to approval of details, the provision of the route (other than for emergency purposes) would result in no vehicular movements along the private access road, or at the existing junction with Lidsey Road. Furthermore, the proposed development will not generate any significant number of HGV movements (other than during construction), and far fewer than the extant nursery use, should that have still been in use.

Proposed Use -

The TA states that the TRICS database has been used to calculate the multi-modal trip generation associated with the proposed development, which is proposed to be for up to 130 dwellings. It also confirms that the trip rates have been accepted by WSCC Highways as part of pre-application discussions. The full parameters used and the resultant TRICS output files can be found in Appendix 14 in the TA.

The trip rates and resultant multi-modal trips associated with up to 130 dwellings for the surveyed network AM and PM peak hours 0800-0900 and 1600-1700 are set out in Table 7.1 and Table 7.2, respectively. These (taken directly from the TA) are as follows:

	Trip Rates (per dwelling)				
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Daily
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	
Total Vehicle	0.141	0.362	0.262	0.15	4.426
Cyclist	0.009	0.029	0.021	0.01	0.21
Pedestrian	0.054	0.148	0.076	0.04	1.184
Public Transport	0.002	0.043	0.019	0.004	0.254
Total People	0.223	0.812	0.518	0.256	7.744

Table 7.1 – Trip rate

	Trip Generation (130 Dwellings)				
	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Daily
	Arrival	Departure	Arrival	Departure	
Total Vehicle	18	47	34	20	575
Cyclist	1	4	3	1	27
Pedestrian	7	19	10	5	154
Public Transport	0	6	2	1	33
Total People	29	106	67	33	1,007

Table 7.2 - Multi-Modal Development Trips

Table 7.2 shows that 130 dwellings would result in 65 vehicle movements during the AM peak hour and 54 movements during the PM peak hour with fewer at other times. Daily flows would be 575.

Trip distribution –

The proposed development traffic would be distributed onto the local highway network based on the observed peak hour flows identified in the base traffic data (summarised in Section 2.0 found in the TA). This was agreed as part of the pre-application discussions

with WSCC Highways and was also the agreed approach taken for AL/129/21/OUT and AL/70/23/OUT.

The traffic distribution is demonstrated in the TA as Figure 7.1 and Figure 7.2 for the AM and PM peak hours and are contained in Appendix 13.

Background Traffic Growth -

It has been agreed with WSCC Highways that capacity assessments of the local highway network will include the following assessment years:

- a)** 2024 - Year of application without proposed development
- b)** 2028 - Interim year without proposed development, without mitigation proposed as part of Phase 1 A29 Scheme
- c)** 2028 - Interim year without proposed development, with mitigation proposed as part of Phase 1 A29 Scheme (War Memorial Roundabout only)
- d)** 2028 - Interim year (with development, i.e. opening year) without mitigation proposed as part of Phase 1 A29 Scheme
- e)** 2028 - Interim year (with development, i.e. opening year), with mitigation proposed as part of Phase 1 A29 Scheme (War Memorial Roundabout only)
- f)** 2031 - End of Arun Local Plan Period without proposed development (including mitigation proposed as part of Phase 1 A29 scheme)
- g)** 2031 - End of Arun Local Plan Period with proposed development (including mitigation proposed as part of Phase 1 A29 scheme)

The TA also includes a sensitivity test for 2031 with an additional 700 dwellings. This is provided as a Technical Note (HTp/2401/TN/03) within Appendix 15. While this work is acknowledged, the Highway Authority now also require a modelling test to show the impact of the development in all scenarios without Phase 1 A29 in-place, to include 689 homes from BEW (actually 600 from BEW plus 89 off Meadow Way recently approved at Planning Appeal) with the proposed traffic from this development added to that, essentially to demonstrate what the impact of that quantum of development would have on the junctions modelled sans Phase 1 A29.

The base traffic data, as set out in Section 2.0 of the TA, has been growthed using NTEM TEMPro v8.1.

Junction Assessments -

As agreed with WSCC Highways during pre-applications discussions, the following junctions would be examined and tested in the capacity assessments:

- a)** A29/Barnham Road/Fontwell Avenue (War memorial roundabout)
- b)** A29 Woodgate railway crossing
- c)** Site access junction
- d)** A29/A259 Saltbox roundabout

Site Access Junction -

The proposed site access junction has been assessed using PICADY analysis.

The outputs of the PICADY assessments are set out in the following tables with the full output at Appendix 17 in the TA:

Table 8.1:

- I. 2024 Base + Committed Development
- II. 2024 Base + Proposed Development
- III. 2024 Base + Proposed Development+ Committed Development

Table 8.2:

- IV. 2028 Base + Committed Development
- V. 2028 Base + Proposed Development
- v1. 2028 Base + Proposed Development+ Committed Development

Table 8.3:

- vII1. 2031 Base + Committed Development
- vII1. 2031 Base + Proposed Development
- Ix. 2031 Base + Proposed Development+ Committed Development

The TA states that given that the site access will be in operation once the development associated with AL/129/21/OUT and AL/70/23/OUT is under construction, a comparison has been provided between the base year + committed development scenario and the base year + proposed development + committed development scenario to demonstrate what the impact of the proposed development will be on the junction.

From Table 8.1 – Site access/A29 Lidsey Road capacity analysis 2024 - found in the TA, it can be seen that during the AM peak hour, with the vehicle movements associated with the proposed development using the site access junction with Lidsey Road, on the site access arm, there is an increase in RFC of 0.10 with queuing of up to one vehicle and during the PM peak hour there is an increase in RFC of 0.06, with queuing of up to one vehicle when compared to with only committed development using the site access.

With the proposed development traffic using the site access junction, during the AM peak hour, the A29 Lidsey Road has an increase in RFC of 0.01 with no vehicles recorded queuing, and during the PM peak hour, there is an increase in RFC of 0.04, with queuing of up to one vehicle when compared to with only committed development using the site access.

Based on the figures provided, the increase in RFC and queuing at the junction is negligible and would be unlikely to have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

From Table 8.2 - Site access/A29 Lidsey Road capacity analysis 2028 - (also found in the TA), during the AM peak hour, with the vehicle movements associated with the proposed development using the site access junction with Lidsey Road, on the site access arm, there is an increase in RFC of 0.10 with queuing of up to one vehicle and during the PM peak hour there is an increase in RFC of 0.06, with queuing of up to one vehicle when compared to with only committed development using the site access.

With the proposed development traffic using the site access junction, during the AM peak hour, the A29 Lidsey Road has an increase in RFC of 0.01 with no vehicles recorded queuing, and during the PM peak hour, there is an increase in RFC of 0.04, with queuing of up to one vehicle when compared to with only committed development using the site access.

Based on the figures provided, the increase in RFC and queuing at the junction is negligible and would be unlikely to have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

From Table 8.3 in the TA - Site access/A29 Lidsey Road capacity analysis 2031 - it can be seen that during the AM peak hour, with the vehicle movements associated with the proposed development using the site access junction with Lidsey Road, on the site access arm, there is an increase in RFC of 0.10 with queuing of up to one vehicle and during the PM peak hour there is an increase in RFC of 0.06, with queuing of up to one vehicle when compared to with only committed development using the site access.

With the proposed development traffic using the site access junction, during the AM peak hour, the A29 Lidsey Road has an increase in RFC of 0.01 with no vehicles recorded queuing, and during the PM peak hour, there is an increase in RFC of 0.04, with queuing of up to one vehicle when compared to with only committed development using the site access.

Based on the figures provided, the increase in RFC and queuing at the junction is negligible and would be unlikely to have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

Based on the flows input into the modelling, the TA shows that the site access junction would operate well within capacity, with queuing of up to only one vehicle waiting to turn into the site from Lidsey Road in 2031, which can be accommodated in the right turn lane of the proposed junction. Therefore, the applicants consider that the access junction approved under application AL/129/21/OUT is still acceptable for use for the traffic added by this planning application.

Woodgate Level Crossing -

A standalone LinSig model of Woodgate level crossing has been provided in the TA using a mixture of site observations, flows calculated within the TA and traffic surveys.

The current barrier down-time is based on a survey undertaken in June 2023, as set out in Section 2.0 found in the TA. Applicant to check to see if timings have changed more recently or are forecast to change and if so, to reflect these in updated modelling assessments.

The Degree of Saturation (DoS) and Mean Maximum Queue Length (MMQL) results are provided at Appendix 17 in the TA and are summarised in the following tables (also found in the TA):

Table 8.4 –

- I. 2024 Base
- II. 2024 Base + Committed Development
- III. 2024 Base + Proposed Development

Iv. 2024 Base + Proposed Development+ Committed Development

Table 8.5 –

v. 2028 Base

v1. 2028 Base+ Committed Development vI1. 2028 Base + Proposed Development

vII1. 2028 Base+ Proposed Development + Committed Development

Table 8.6 –

Ix. 2031 Base

x. 2031 Base+ Committed Development x1. 2031 Base + Proposed Development

xI1. 2031 Base+ Proposed Development + Committed Development

A comparison has been carried out for each of the scenarios against the base year flows.

From Table 8.4 - *Level crossing analysis 2024* - in the TA, compared to 2024 base, with the proposed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, the TA shows that there would be an increase of up to one vehicle queuing southbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 139 metres to 143 metres) and up to two vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 158 metres to 166 metres). This is compared to up to four additional vehicles queuing southbound with committed development applied to the local highway network (i.e. an increase in queue length from 139 metres to 160 metres), and up to 10 vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 158 metres to 213 metres).

During the PM peak hour, with the proposed development applied to the local highway network, the TA shows that there could be up to an additional three vehicles queuing southbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 300 metres to 315 metres) and up to one additional vehicle queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 129 metres to 131 metres). This is compared to up to 18 vehicles queuing southbound with committed development applied to the local highway network (i.e. an increase in queue length from 300 metres to 399 metres), and up to five vehicles queuing northbound i.e. an increase in queue length from 129 metres to 153 metres).

In scenario 2024 base + proposed development + committed development, the TA shows that both AM and PM Peak hours the northbound queue would not reach the vehicular site access with a queue length of 223 metres and 156 metres long respectively. The southbound queue would reach 163 metres in the AM peak hour and 417 metres PM peak hour. During the AM peak hour, the southbound queue would not reach the primary school. While it would pass the school access in the PM peak, this queuing occurs outside of school hours.

The TA concludes that the proposed development would result in negligible additional queuing at the level crossing in 2024 which would not have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

From Table 8.5 - *Level crossing analysis 2028* – in the TA, compared to 2028 base, with the proposed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, the TA shows that there would be an increase of up to one vehicle queuing southbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 145 metres to 149 metres) and up to two vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 164 metres to 173 metres). This is compared to up to four additional vehicles queuing southbound

with committed development applied to the local highway network (i.e. an increase in queue length from 145 metres to 166 metres), and up to 10 vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 164 metres to 220 metres).

During the PM peak hour, with the proposed development applied to the local highway network, there could be up to an additional three vehicles queuing southbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 317 metres to 334 metres) and up to one additional vehicle queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 135 metres to 137 metres). This is compared to up to 19 vehicles queuing southbound with committed development applied to the local highway network (i.e. an increase in queue length from 317 metres to 421 metres), and up to five vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 135 metres to 159 metres).

In scenario 2028 base + proposed development + committed development the northbound queue would not reach the vehicular site access in either of the AM and PM peak hours with queue lengths of 233 metres and 162 metres respectively. The southbound queue length would reach 170 metres in the AM peak hour and 440 metres PM peak hour. In this scenario, again, during the AM peak hour, the southbound queue would not reach the primary school. While it would pass the school access in the PM peak, this queueing occurs outside of school hours.

The TA concludes that the proposed development would result in negligible additional queuing at the level crossing in 2028 which would not have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

From Table 8.6 - *Level crossing analysis 2028* - compared to 2031 base, with the proposed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, the TA shows that there would be an increase of up to one vehicle queuing southbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 151 metres to 155 metres) and up to two vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 171 metres to 180 metres). This is compared to up to four additional vehicles queuing southbound with committed development applied to the local highway network (i.e. an increase in queue length from 151 metres to 173 metres), and up to 10 vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 171 metres to 228 metres).

During the PM peak hour, with the proposed development applied to the local highway network, the TA shows that there could be up to an additional three vehicles queuing southbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 334 metres to 349 metres) and up to one additional vehicle queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 139 metres to 142 metres). This is compared to up to 20 vehicles queuing southbound with committed development applied to the local highway network (i.e. an increase in queue length from 334 metres to 443 metres), and up to five vehicles queuing northbound (i.e. an increase in queue length from 139 metres to 165 metres).

During the PM peak hour, the northbound queue is equivalent to circa 175 metres, which does not reach the proposed site access.

In scenario 2031 base+ proposed development+ committed development, in both AM and PM peak hours, the northbound queue would not reach the vehicular site access with the queue lengths recorded as 240 metres and 168 metres respectively. The southbound queue would extent in this scenario to 176 metres in the AM peak hour and 463 metres PM peak hour. As with other scenarios, the southbound queue would not reach the primary school in the AM peak but would pass it in the PM peak.

The TA concludes that the proposed development would result in negligible in queuing at the level crossing in 2031 and would not, as such, have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

Additionally, when the A29 realignment comes forward in-full, traffic queues at the level crossing will decrease as the new road will allow vehicles to bypass the level crossing. Therefore, any increases in queueing brought about by this development, the subject of this planning application, would only be for the short term.

War Memorial Roundabout –

As set out in Section 2.0 in the TA, the base flows at the War Memorial roundabout are taken from the Chichester Area Transport Model (CATM), to be consistent with the BEW Parcel SC1 and Cala planning applications.

The War Memorial roundabout has been assessed using ARCADY.

The outputs of the ARCADY assessments are set out in the following tables with the full output at Appendix 17, found in the TA:

Table 8.7 –

- 1. 2024 Base
- 11. 2024 Base+ Committed Development
- 111. 2024 Base + Proposed Development
- Iv. 2024 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development

Table 8.8 –

- v. 2028 Base
- v1. 2028 Base+ Committed Development
- vI1. 2028 Base + Proposed Development
- vII1. 2028 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development
- Ix. 2028 Base+ Committed Development+ Phase 1 A29 Scheme
- x. 2028 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development + Phase 1 A29 Scheme

Table 8.9 –

- x1. 2031 Base
- xI1. 2031 Base+ Committed Development
- xII1. 2031 Base+ Proposed Development
- xiv. 2031 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development
- xv. 2031 Base+ Committed Development+ Phase 1 A29 Scheme
- xvi. 2031 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development+ Phase 1 A29 Scheme

The TA states that a comparison has been carried out of each scenario against the base year.

Additionally, in assessment years 2028 and 2031, a comparison has been carried out of the scenario with and without the Phase 1 A29 realignment scheme.

From Table 8.7 – *War Memorial roundabout assessment 2024* – found in the TA, in 2024, with no proposed development or committed development on the local highway network, all arms of the junction appear to be working within capacity during both the AM and PM peak hours.

With the committed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, the TA concludes that all arms of the junction are working within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue is reaching theoretical capacity with an RFC of 0.92, i.e. an increase in RFC of 0.10 compared to the 2024 base scenario.

With the proposed development applied to the local highway network, all arms at the junction are working within capacity in both the AM and PM peak hours.

With both the proposed development and committed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction appear to continue to work well within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue has an RFC of 0.93, which is reaching theoretical capacity. However, given that the proposed development is only a small proportion of the increase in RFC, i.e. 0.01, the TA concludes that the impact of the application proposals is acceptable, as it would not contribute to a 'severe' residual cumulative impact on the local highway network.

In Table 8.8, found in the TA - *War Memorial roundabout assessment 2028* - it says that in 2028, with no additional traffic applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction appear to be working within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue is starting to reach theoretical capacity with an RFC of 0.86.

With the committed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction appear to be working within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue is starting to reach theoretical capacity with an RFC of 0.95, i.e. an increase in RFC of 0.09 compared to the 2028 base scenario.

With the proposed development applied to the local highway network, all arms at the junction appear to be working within capacity in the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue has an RFC of 0.87, however, this is an increase of only 0.01 compared to the 2028 base scenario.

With both the proposed development and committed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction continue to work well within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue has an RFC of 0.97, which is reaching theoretical capacity. However, given that the proposed development is only a small proportion of the increase in RFC, i.e. 0.01, the TA concludes that it is not considered that the impact of the application site results in a severe residual cumulative impact on the local highway network.

With Phase 1 of the A29 scheme applied, all arms appear to be working within theoretical capacity in both the AM and PM peak hours with both the proposed development and committed development applied to the local highway network. Table 8.8 shows that there is a significant decrease in queuing, delay and RFC on all arms across the AM and PM peak hours.

The TA concludes that given that the Phase 1 A29 scheme has been granted permission, with construction of the road planned to start in Spring/Summer 2025 and anticipated to be completed by Spring 2027, it is considered that appropriate mitigation is in place, and therefore no additional mitigation is required.

From Table 8.9 - *War Memorial roundabout assessment 2031* – the TA says that in 2031, with no additional traffic applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction are working within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue is starting to reach theoretical capacity with an RFC of 0.89.

With the committed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction are working within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue is starting to reach theoretical capacity with an RFC of 0.98, i.e. an increase in RFC of 0.09 compared to the 2031 base scenario.

With the proposed development applied to the local highway network, all arms at the junction appear to be working well within capacity in the AM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue has an RFC of 0.90, however, this is an increase of only 0.01 compared to the 2031 base scenario.

With both the proposed development and committed development applied to the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, all arms of the junction appear to continue to work well within capacity. During the PM peak hour, the A29 Fontwell Avenue has an RFC of 1.0, which means the junction will reach theoretical capacity. However, given that the proposed development is only a small proportion of the increase in RFC, i.e. 0.01, the TA concludes that the impact of the vehicle movements associated with the application site would not have a discernible impact on the local highway network.

With Phase 1 of the A29 scheme constructed and open to traffic, all arms are working within theoretical capacity in both the AM and PM peak hours with both the proposed development and committed development applied to the local highway network. Table 8.9 shows that there is a significant decrease in queuing, delay and RFC on all arms across the AM and PM peak hours.

The TA concludes that given that the Phase 1 A29 scheme has been granted permission, with construction of the road planned to start in Spring/Summer 2025 and anticipated to be completed by Spring 2027, it is considered that appropriate mitigation is in place, and therefore no additional mitigation is required. Additionally, the TA concludes that the proposed development will not compromise the delivery of the BEW Local Plan Strategic Allocation.

Saltbox Roundabout -

The Saltbox roundabout has also been assessed using ARCADY, with the full outputs found in Appendix 17 in the TA. Two capacity assessment scenarios have been carried out, as follows:

1. Without any mitigation on the roundabout, i.e. geometry based on the existing roundabout:

Table 8.10 –

- a. 2024 Base
- b. 2024 Base + Proposed Development
- c. 2024 Base+ Committed Development
- d. 2024 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development

Table 8.11 –

- e. 2028 Base
- f. 2028 Base + Proposed Development
- g. 2028 Base+ Committed Development
- h. 2028 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development

Table 8.12 –

- 1. 2031 Base
 - J. 2031 Base + Proposed Development
 - k. 2031 Base+ Committed Development
 - I. 2031 Base+ Proposed Development+ Committed Development
2. Scenarios 1. a-I with mitigation proposed in ADC's Local Plan (Tables 8.13-8.15 found in the TA), which includes:
- a. Widening on the A259 to provide three entry lanes
 - b. Widening on A29 (southern arm) to provide three entry lanes
 - c. Widening on A29 (northern arm) to provide three entry lanes

A comparison has been carried out of each scenario against the base year.

Table 8.10 found in the TA - Saltbox roundabout capacity analysis (no mitigation) 2024 – shows that on all arms of the Saltbox roundabout, traffic associated with the proposed development will have a significantly lesser impact on the junction than the approved committed development when compared to the 2024 base traffic.

During the AM peak hour of the 2024 base scenario, the A259 shows that it is starting to reach theoretical capacity, with an RFC of 0.85. However, with the proposed development included on the highway network, the RFC only increases by 0.01, which is a very small increase. The RFC increases to 0.03 with the committed development included on the highway network.

With both committed development and proposed development on the local highway network, the A259 has an RFC of 0.89, i.e. an increase of 0.04 RFC. Queue length is up to eight vehicles with a delay of up to 26 seconds, which is not significant. All other arms appear to be within capacity. The TA concludes that the impact of the application site on this junction would not be significant.

During the PM peak hour, all arms are shown as being within capacity with both committed development and proposed development on the local highway network.

Therefore, given the small increases in traffic including resultant delay, the applicant considers that it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would not give rise to a severe residual cumulative impact on the operation of the Saltbox roundabout.

From Table 8.11 in the TA - Saltbox roundabout capacity analysis (no mitigation) 2028 - this shows that on all arms of the Saltbox roundabout, traffic associated with the proposed development would have a significantly lesser impact on the than the approved committed development when compared to the 2028 base traffic.

In the AM peak hour of this base scenario, the A259 is shown to be starting to reach theoretical capacity, with an RFC of 0.89. However, with the proposed development included on the highway network, the RFC only increases by 0.01, which is not a significant increase. There is an RFC increase of 0.03 with the committed development included on the highway network.

With both committed development and proposed development on the local highway network, the A259 has an RFC of 0.93, which is an increase in RFC of 0.04. Queue length is up to 11 vehicles with a delay of up to 37 seconds, which the TA does not consider to be severe. All other arms appear to be within capacity. The TA concludes by saying that given that the proposed development is only a small proportion of the increase in RFC, that the impact of the application site should not be considered significant.

During the PM peak hour, with both committed development and proposed development on the local highway network, the A259 and A29 (southern arm) are shown to have an RFC of 0.86 and 0.85 respectively. However, the queue lengths are only six vehicles on each arm, with a delay of up to 20 seconds on the A259 and up to 12 seconds on the A29 (southern arm) which the TA says is not a significant delay. All other arms appear to be within capacity.

The TA concludes this section by saying that it has demonstrated that the impact of the development traffic on the Saltbox roundabout would not result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the local highway network, and that the queues are such that they would not have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

In Table 8.12 in the TA - *Saltbox roundabout capacity analysis (no mitigation) 2031* – this shows that on all arms of the Saltbox roundabout, traffic associated with the proposed development would have a significantly lesser impact on the than the approved committed development when compared to the 2031 base traffic.

In the AM peak hour of the 2031 base scenario, the A259 shows that it is starting to reach theoretical capacity, with an RFC of 0.92. However, with the proposed development included on the highway network, the RFC only increases by 0.01 which is not a significant increase. There is an RFC increase of 0.04 with the committed development included on the highway network.

With both committed development and proposed development on the local highway network, during the AM peak hour, the A259 has an RFC of 0.97, resulting in an increase in RFC of 0.05, with a queue length of up to 18 vehicles and delay of up to 53 seconds. All other arms are within capacity. The TA considers that these increases should not be considered significant.

During the PM peak hour in this scenario, the A259 shows that it is starting to reach theoretical capacity, with an RFC of 0.86. However, with the proposed development included on the highway network, the RFC only increases by 0.01 which the TA considers not to be a significant increase, whereas there is an RFC increase of only 0.03 with the committed development included on the highway network.

With both committed development and proposed development on the local highway network, during the PM peak hour, the A259 and A29 (southern arm) are shown to have an RFC of 0.89 and 0.88 respectively. Queue lengths are eight vehicles on each arm, with a delay of up to 26 seconds on the A259 and up to 15 seconds on the A29 (southern arm) which the TA considers not to be a significant delay. All other arms are within capacity.

The TA concludes that it has demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a 'severe' residual cumulative impact on the Saltbox roundabout and that the resultant queues would be too low to have a noticeable impact in terms of capacity or safety on the junction.

Impact at Saltbox roundabout with proposed Local Plan highways mitigation –

To demonstrate how the roundabout would operate with the proposed Local Plan mitigation in place, a capacity analysis of the Saltbox roundabout with the proposed mitigation geometry has been carried out, and is set out in Table 8.13 in the TA, with the full results contained in Appendix 17 (also in the TA).

Table 8.13 in the TA – *Saltbox roundabout capacity analysis (with mitigation) 2024* – demonstrates that on all arms of the Saltbox roundabout with the planned mitigation proposed in ADC's Local Plan in place, traffic associated with the proposed development will have a significantly lesser impact on the roundabout than the approved committed development when compared to the 2024 base traffic.

It is also demonstrated that that all arms of the roundabout appear to be operating within theoretical capacity in all scenarios.

Table 8.14 - *Saltbox roundabout capacity analysis (with mitigation) 2028* – demonstrates that on all arms of the Saltbox roundabout with the proposed mitigation in place, traffic associated with the proposed development will have a significantly lesser impact on the roundabout than the approved committed development when compared to the 2028 base traffic.

It is also demonstrated that all arms of the roundabout are operating within theoretical capacity in all scenarios.

Table 8.15 - *Saltbox roundabout capacity analysis (with mitigation) 2031* – shows that on all arms of the Saltbox roundabout with the planned mitigation proposed in ADC's Local Plan in place, traffic associated with the proposed development would have a significantly lesser impact on the roundabout than the approved committed development when compared to the 2031 base traffic.

It can also be seen that all arms of the roundabout are operating within theoretical capacity in all scenarios.

The TA concludes that it does not consider that any further mitigation is required at the roundabout as a result of the proposed development as it considers that the impact would not be significant on residual capacity or delay, when compared to the roundabout with committed development included.

Rowan Way -

The impact of development traffic at the A259 Rowan Way/A29 Shripney Road/Steving Way has also been considered in the TA.

The distribution of traffic at the roundabout has been based on the results on an Manual Classified Count (MCC) survey carried out in September 2023.

The distribution of development traffic for the the AM and PM peak hour periods at the Rowan Way roundabout is shown in Figure 8.2 and Figure 8.3, respectively, found in the TA.

Figure's 8.2 and 8.3 show that the amount of development traffic arising from the application site at the Rowan Way roundabout is too low to have a significant cumulative impact on safety or capacity and would fall within the variation of flow that occurs at the junction on a daily basis. Therefore, the TA concludes that no further capacity assessments of the junction are required.

Strategic Road Network (SRN) A27 -

The impact of development traffic at the following junctions with the A27(T) have been considered:

1. The Fontwell East roundabout to the north connecting to the A27(T)
11. The Fontwell West roundabout to the north connecting to the A27(T)
111. The Bognor Road junction to the west connecting to the A27(T)

The TA states that the distribution to the three junctions has been based on the results of an MCC survey carried out in June 2016 and that the results of this MCC survey were submitted in support of the BEW consortium development proposals, and have been used to demonstrate the impact of the development on the SRN as part of the AL/129/21/OUT and AL/70/23/OUT applications, which was agreed by National Highways.

The distribution of development traffic for the the AM and PM peak hour periods is shown in Figure 8.4 and Figure 8.5, respectively (both found in the TA).

The TA concludes that from the data shown in Figure's 8.4 and 8.5, it is shown that the amount of development traffic arising from the application site is too low to have a significant cumulative impact on safety or capacity of the SRN and, like that for the Rowan Way junction mentioned previously, would fall within the variation of flow that occurs on a daily basis. Therefore, the TA does not consider that any further capacity assessments of the junction or mitigation is required.

As the SRN is one that is within the remit of National Highways, the case officer should consult that Highway Authority for their comments.

Internal layout design.

The planning application is submitted in outline form, save for access to the public highway. As such, should planning permission be forthcoming for this application, final details of the internal layout would need to be submitted for approval as part of reserved matters and/or discharge of conditions.

From scrutiny of the internal road layout, all roads – particularly the 'spine' access road linking the approved developments to the south to the site because of its relatively straight and uninterrupted alignment – will require speed controls to be implemented to manage vehicle speeds. All roads should be provided with street lighting, as should any foot and cycle paths proposed. Likewise, the foot, cycle and emergency access linking directly to the A29 should also be lit and a suitable bollard (or bollards) provided to prevent access by other vehicles. Such bollards should meet the requirements of the Fire and Rescue Service in that they should be ones that can be opened/removed in the event that the route is needed for emergency purposes. This list should not be considered exhaustive.

Parking.

Arun District Council has its own Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) covering parking at developments. The applicant will need to demonstrate that parking provision for cars, cycles and electric vehicles (EV) all comply with that guidance.

Travel Plan.

The supplied Travel Plan is largely acceptable to the Highway Authority. However, it requires a list of penalty measures to be implemented in the event the five-year trip reduction target is not met. Measures should include (but not necessarily be limited to), the provision of a second round of travel vouchers for each household for redemption

towards bus season tickets, bus 'taster' tickets, bicycle purchase, active travel personal planning measures, additional on-site bicycle parking etc. Applicant to amend.

Conclusion.

The following additional information is required to enable the Highway Authority to consider the proposal further. Full details of each can be found in the main body of this response but is summarised below:

1. Applicant to see if any later PIA records are available and if so, provide these.
2. Road Safety Audit Decision Log to be made available in Microsoft WORD format for the Highway Authority to add its comments.
3. Plan to be provided showing the design details of the foot, cycle (and emergency vehicle?) connection to A29 Woodgate Road. Plan should show how the proposed works interface with those works proposed as part of the nearby Woodgate Centre off-site foot and cycle works.
4. Additional modelling assessments should be provided to show the impact of the development in all scenarios without Phase 1 A29 in-place - to include 689 homes from BEW (actually 600 from BEW plus 89 off Meadow Way recently approved at Planning Appeal) with the proposed traffic from this development added to that.
5. For the Woodgate railway crossing modelling, applicant to look to see if crossing times have altered since their modelling was undertaken (and whether any other changes are forecast for any future changes to crossing 'down-time') and if so, to reflect these in updated modelling assessments.
6. Travel Plan – penalty measures to be added.

Please re-consult when the above information is available, at which time the Highway Authority will consider the proposal further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services

From: Nicola Spencer on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 24 September 2024 18:15
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: AL/89/24/OUT - WSCC Highways response
Attachments: AL 89 24 OUT.docx

Nicola Spencer
Technical Support Manager
Planning Services

T: 01903 737945
E: nicola.spencer@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to <https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: Leanne Richardson <Leanne.Richardson@arun.gov.uk>
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2024 4:18 PM
To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: AL/89/24/OUT - WSCC Highways response

Hi Team

Please could the attached consultation response from WSCC Highways be uploaded and recorded.

Thank you

Leanne

Leanne Richardson (She / Her)
Principal Planning Officer Consultant
Strategic Development Team, Planning

T: 07936 036082
E: leanne.richardson@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notification of planning applications in your area please go to www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder



From: Tim Townsend <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2024 2:32 PM
To: Leanne Richardson <Leanne.Richardson@arun.gov.uk>
Cc: Jamie Brown <[REDACTED]>
Subject: AL/89/24/OUT - WSCC Highways response

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 Leanne,

I refer to your email of 23 September 2024, sent to my colleague Jamie Brown, asking when a highways-related response to the above planning application will be made and by whom.

I can confirm that a response was sent by me to the generic Arun District Council Planning in-box last Thursday, 19 September 2024. Another copy is attached to this email for your information and records. I was the Highways officer allocated the planning application to reply to.

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
[REDACTED]



LEGAL DISCLAIMER
This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.