

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:Michael Eastham
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	11 August 2020
LOCATION:	Land South of Water Lane Angmering
SUBJECT:	A/109/20/RES Approval of reserved matters following outline consent A/99/17/OUT for 175 No dwellings & associated infrastructure. This application may affect the setting of a listed building, may affect the character & appearance of the Angmering Conservation Area & falls within Strategic Site SD9, CIL Zone 1 (Zero Rated).
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Modification
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

1. Comments are made against,

- Planning Layout (drawing no. PLN-1-1101 Revision T)
- Reserved Matters Materials Layout Sheet 1 (drawing no. A290-RM-701 Revision P2)
- Reserved Matters Materials Layout Sheet 2 (drawing no. A290-RM-702 Revision P2)
- Reserved Matters Transport Statement, dated 16th June 2020
- Design and Access Statement

2. Details of materials are provided. These details indicate that certain aspects are to be provided to an adoptable standard. At this stage, WSCC Highways are not reviewing the details in terms of acceptability for adoption as public highway; WSCC Highways are reviewing the details only for their planning acceptability. Materials are not being approved for adoption by WSCC Highways at this stage.

3. The carriageway widths have been considered against the guidance within Manual for Streets. Reference to carriageway widths are also included in section 5.4 of the Design and Access Statement. For the most part, the proposed road widths are considered appropriate.

4. Certain roads are though designed with a 4.1 metre width. This includes a long length between plots 72 and 107. It is accepted that this is a long straight section of road with good forward visibility. As such using a narrower width may act to restrict vehicle speeds (it is noted that a build out is included that narrows the road further). This road width is however very narrow and has the potential to cause difficult in allowing two opposing vehicles to pass. The road width should therefore be increased particularly if the expectation is for this to be adopted as public highway. Further measures may be required to restrain vehicle speeds as a consequence of any widening. This could include change in surfacing and/or local narrowings.
5. A 4.1 metre wide shared surface is also proposed serving plots 50 to 56. Again, 4.1 metres isn't ideal particularly as this is a shared surface with vehicles sharing the same space as pedestrians. Due consideration is though given to this being a short section of road that serves relatively few dwellings, with resultant light traffic flows. The road width here is considered more appropriate. The only comment that would be made regarding this length of shared surfacing is in terms of material. It is standard practice to design shared surfaces with contrasting material to those areas with segregated carriageways and footways. This length of shared surface is however indicated to be surfaced in tarmacadam. The surfacing should be changed to block paving.
6. A foot/cycle way is provided running north to south along the main spine road through the site. The route provides a connection from Water Lane to High Street to the south. Although not stated, this route is understood to form an unsegregated track rather than including any form of segregation. The design of the routes within the site should be assessed against the recently published LTN 1/20. Certain aspects of the design of this route may need to be altered, for example, to ensure continuity across junctions.
7. The length verge on the opposite side of the carriageway to plot 132 should be footway. This will then provide a continuous route between the footway running along the initial length of access road leading from Water Lane to the cul-de-sac serving plots 143-149.
8. Visibility splays are shown are some of the junctions within the site. Those shown are based on a 20mph design speed, which is acceptable in principle. Some of the splays however cross what will be residential front gardens. In practice, this is unlikely to pose an issue as MfS2 enables splays to be drawn to the nearside path of an oncoming vehicle. Visibility should not then be obstructed if planting occurs within the splays as currently drawn.

9. The Design and Access Statement refers to the cycle route through to Weavers Hill too although the Transport Statement refers to this as a footpath only. There seems no reason why a pedestrian and cyclist route could not be achieved onto Weavers Hill. The width of the route to Weavers Hill however measures only 2 metres. At a minimum, the width of the route should be 3 metres. The design of the 'Litch Gate' must also include no obstructions to cyclists such barriers or bollards.
10. The Transport Statement assess car parking provision against the adopted Arun DC standards. The parking provision appears to satisfy the requirements in the standards.
11. The Local Planning Authority may wish to consult their waste collection team and the Fire Service respectively regarding the acceptability of the refuse collection arrangements and the suitability of the emergency access onto High Street.
12. Further information would be required to address the above points.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services