

Our ref: TQ052055 (64434)
Your ref: A/74/13/

Elizabeth Cleaver
4C, Federated House
London Road
Dorking, RH4 1SZ

Mr C Cronin
Arun District Council
Arun Civic Centre
Maltravers Road
Littlehampton
West Sussex
BN17 5LF


27 June 2013

Dear Mr Cronin,

THE VINERY, POLING

Thank you for inviting views on the planning application A/74/13 which seeks planning permission for a proposed distribution warehouse and covered storage, trade counter and associated offices. The application includes the upgrading of the access road and improvement of the existing junction with the A27. We note that this application is a departure from the Development Plan and also affects a public Right of Way.

The Highways Agency is an executive agency of the Department for Transport. We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. In the case of development at The Vinery, we are concerned with the operation of the A27, in particular the A27/A284 (Crossbush) and A27/A280 junctions. These junctions, and others on the A27 within Arun are known to experience capacity issues, as is set out within supporting information to the Arun Local Plan, notably the Arun Transport Study for Strategic Development (WSP, 2013).

We have reviewed the Transport Context Report prepared by Millwood House Consultants, dated May 2013 and the Planning, Design and Access Statement prepared by Paul Airey Planning Associates, also dated May 2013.

When we are assessing planning applications for their impact upon the SRN we look to establish the peak hour traffic that a development will place onto the network. Should sufficient traffic be generated a transport assessment (TA) is normally required. In this instance, no transport assessment has been produced and we cannot see the reasoning as to why this has not been produced. We understand that the proposed development site is an undeveloped area of approximately 4.65 ha (11.5 acres), immediately south of the existing industrial buildings at the Vinery and developments of this size and nature often require TAs to support the application.

The development proposals comprise of a warehouse and office building of 6,400 m², covered storage of 5,337 m² and associated roadways and parking. The document, Guidance on Transport Assessment (Department for Transport 2007)

provides advice on thresholds for when a TA should be produced; and accordingly such a document should be produced from the Vinery site. The document also sets out in detail the expected content of a TA.

We also require that developers follow the Highways Agency's "A Protocol for Dealing with Planning Applications" document. The protocol can be accessed at this link: <http://www.highways.gov.uk/publications/planning-protocols-for-planning-and-development/>.

One key aspect of the protocol document is the requirement for junction capacity assessments and merge / diverge assessments at opening year and ten years after registration of application; this work should be undertaken if more than 30 two-way trips on any strategic road network junction or slip road are generated by development proposals.

Although a TA has not been prepared, we have reviewed the supporting transport materials that accompany the planning application.

Taking the Transport Context Report, we are content that the methodology used to establish the existing and permitted trip generation of the site (including the residential element), appears to be reasonable. However, in a TA, we would expect that the supporting information (or extracts thereof), to construct the trip generation are contained within an appendices section for verification, as well as turning count information. This is because we need to **assess** the evidence and treat all applications equally and fairly.

Referring to the Design and Access Statement, section 5.3 'Vehicle Movements' sets out a trip generation estimate of the existing Fargo site located at Todington Lane. Whilst the information presented may be an accurate representation of the existing business, we would recommend that turning count surveys are undertaken for the AM and PM peak periods; at present, we have no verifiable information regarding the trip generation of the existing site.

Table 5 of the Transport Context Report sets out that the Fargo site could generate a total of 144 vehicular movements, including 20 HGVs. The table also notes that the combined uses of the site (including existing, permitted and proposed development), could generate a total of 674 vehicular movements, including 138 HGVs.

We note from the Design and Access Statement that the business currently utilises 9,500 m2 of storage at its existing site and a neighbouring rented site in a variety of structures, including warehouses and covered storage structures, 2,500m2 of outside storage, and 500 m2 of offices in a separate building. The Statement sets out that Fargo operates 5 HGVs (rigid trucks) and 2 LGVs, delivering direct to growers throughout the south-east and East Anglia. Whilst the gross floor area of the existing and proposed facilities are similar, no commentary is offered regarding any differences in usage of the new buildings. Given the larger overall site area, we would have some concern that the trip generation of the new facility could be higher, or that there are plans that could change the site's operation compared to the existing Fargo site. The

impression given in the design and access statement is of a growing company that will inevitable generate more traffic as it continues to do so.

Following on from this, we require that the applicant sets out the impact of the development for the AM and PM peak hours, including the preparation of turning movement diagrams for survey, committed, base and development scenarios. We need to establish the impact of the proposed development at the busiest time on the A27, so while the all day trip totals are useful, the peak hour information is vital for our assessment of the evidence, particularly given the location of the site with an access directly onto the A27 and the proximity of the Crossbush junction that regularly experiences peak hour congestion.

As noted previously, we require assessments at the opening year and for ten years after the registration of an application (if more than 30 two-way trips on any strategic road network junction or slip road). As a starting point, we would require that the applicant sets out the trip generation and vehicular distribution for the AM and PM peak hours on the SRN.

We therefore need more information in order to properly assess the implications of the planning application. We are happy to meet with the applicant to discuss our requirements.

We note that changes are proposed to the existing access with the A27. This provides access to Lillian Terrace and the wider Vinery industrial site. Paragraph 5.4.11 of the Design and Access Statement notes that pre-application discussions have been held with us to agree an appropriate junction design. However, whilst we have been consulted on previous planning applications to develop this site, we would note that for this specific application, no agreements have been made. This notwithstanding, we acknowledge the proposals to upgrade the access to accommodate the additional traffic in accordance with relevant standards and attach a detailed Technical Note on this matter.

The proposed improvements to the access with the A27 will need to be designed to a stage at which there can be confidence that the eventual works can be delivered within the highway or land otherwise in the control of the applicant.

The first stage will be for the applicant to demonstrate the proposal complies with our Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, including that any Departures have been justified to and approved by us in accordance with our standard procedures. The applicant should provide us with a Non Motorised User Context Report as set out in para 3.6 of HD 42/05 'Non Motorised User Audits'. Following agreement of any Departures and the completion of preliminary design of the proposed improvement we will require a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) to be carried out in accordance with HD19/03, in particular:

- The Design Team should prepare a draft Audit Brief for the Stage 1 RSA and send it to our designated Project Sponsor for approval. The draft Audit Brief should comply with the requirements of HD19/03 paras 2.61 to 2.63.

- The applicant should provide our designated Project Sponsor with proposals for the Audit Team, including their relevant qualifications, experience and CPD, for the consideration and if appropriate approval of the Project Sponsor. This will enable their suitability to be compared against the requirements of HD19/03 (paras 2.54 to 2.59). Para 2.51 of HD 19/03 requires the Project Sponsor to be satisfied as to the independence and competence of the team to undertake the audit. Therefore the Project Sponsor will also require confirmation that the proposed Audit team are independent of the Design Team (HD 19/03 para 2.49).
- The applicant should provide the Project Sponsor with contact details for the proposed Audit Team Leader.
- The applicant should note that there should be no contact between the Design Team and the Audit Team other than on the restricted basis set out in HD 19/03.

The applicant should also note that any proposed Exceptions to the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit will need to be considered at Director level within the Highways Agency (HD 19/03 para 2.75).

In view of the additional information that we require from the applicant, I enclose our Form TR110 preventing your Council from granting permission for a period of 56 days. This is to allow the applicant time to provide the information as set out in this letter.

I hope this information is useful. However, please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss the proposals further, or any aspect related to the SRN.

Yours sincerely,



Elizabeth Cleaver
ASSET MANAGER



TR110 (November 2011)

 An Executive Agency of
 The Department for Transport

**Developments Affecting Trunk Roads and Special Roads
 Highways Agency Response to an Application for Planning Permission**

From: Divisional Director, Network Delivery and Development, South East, Highways Agency.

 To: Arun District Council

 Council's Reference: A/74/13/

Referring to the notification of a planning application dated 5 June 2013 (received 6 June 2013), your reference A/74/13/, in connection with the A27, The Vinery, Poling, BN18 9PY for Distribution warehouse, covered storage, trade counter and offices, upgrading of access road and existing junction with A27, notice is hereby given under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 that the Secretary of State for Transport:-

- ~~a) offers no objection;~~
- ~~b) advises that planning permission should either be refused, or granted only subject to conditions~~
- ~~c) directs conditions to be attached to any planning permission which may be granted;~~
- ~~d) directs that planning permission is not granted for an indefinite period of time;~~
- e) directs that planning permission not be granted for a specified period (see Annex A).

(delete as appropriate)

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

Date: 27 June 2013	Signature: 
Name: Paul Harwood	Position: Regional Lead Economic Development
The Highways Agency: Federated House, London Road, Dorking, RH4 1SZ	

Condition(s) to be attached to any grant of planning permission:

Reason(s) for the direction given at b), c) or d) overleaf and the period of time for a direction at e) when directing that the application is not granted for a specified period:

Planning permission shall not be granted for a period of 56 days expiring 22 August 2013. This is to allow time for the applicant to provide the information requested in the Agency's letter of 22 August 2013 and the accompanying technical note.

HIGHWAYS AGENCY

**THE VINERY, POLING
HIGHWAY LAYOUT AND ROAD SAFETY**

TECHNICAL NOTE 01

PROJECT: 3511134UK-PTG 155.2

21 JUNE 2013

Prepared by:	Jackie Ackland
Reviewed by:	Nigel Walkden

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 This Technical Note provides comments on the Highways Design and Road Safety aspects of the junction improvement proposed as part of the application for planning permission for the development of The Vinery, Poling, Arundel.

1.1.2 DMRB Standards that have been referred to in compiling this technical note are:

- TD9/93 (incorporating Amendment No.1 2002); and
- TD42/95.

1.1.3 Documents provided for review as part of this assessment are:

- Transport Context report – Junction of The Vinery and A27 Proposed Warehousing Development – Ref 4144C/2.3F dated 30/05/2013;
- Drawing ref 35201-102 Rev B dated 28/05/2013; and
- Planning Design and Access Statement, no reference, dated May 2013

1.1.4 No site visit has been undertaken in carrying out this review however publicly available images from Google Earth have been used for reference, including aerial photography from 2001 and street level images from 2010.

2 ASSESMENT OF PROPOSALS

2.1.1 Sight Stopping Distance requirements set out TD9/93 (as amended) are achieved on the approach to the junction.

2.1.2 Visibility from the side road as listed in TD42/95 Table 7.1 is achievable from a distance of 9m set back from the channel line, provided that the vegetation within the verge to the east of the junction is removed and maintained as grass.

2.1.3 Visibility of the junction form from 15m set back is achievable but will require vegetation removal over a wider area.

- 2.1.4 The pedestrian and cycle route has been set back further into the junction and the visibility of the entire length of the diverge taper should be visible from this point for safety reasons, and the area of the verge where the vegetation should be removed will need to be measured from this point.. An NMU context report should be provided as this will be an inconvenience for pedestrians and cyclists using this route, causing them to deviate from the direct route.
- 2.1.5 The proposed radii of 20m are in accordance with TD42/95 para 7.17.
- 2.1.6 The length of the exit taper at 80m is one step below the deceleration length set out in TD42/95 table 7/5b. This is a substantial improvement over the current situation of 48m, which is between 2 and 3 steps below. The Transport Context report states that current permissions at this site required a taper length of 55m, being 2 steps below, however this was appealed successfully and the taper at 48m would remain under the existing planning consent. Under these circumstances the proposal to provide a diverge taper of 80m as part of a development where there would be less traffic generated than the current permission includes, this is considered to be acceptable.
- 2.1.7 A channelising island in the side road has not been provided within the design and does not exist in the current layout. Where this is not provided, para 7.24 suggests that the nominal approach width should continue up until the tangent point of the curve to join the edge of the major road running carriageway. The approach width of The Vinery is less than 7m, but at the point where the access road joins it is approximately 10m wide, which in turn creates an overly wide crossing point for pedestrians and could encourage vehicles to turn in from the A27 at high speeds. It is suggested that the widened radius curve on the entry to the A27 (i.e. the west side of The Vinery) is moved approximately 2.5m to the east to provide a narrower junction. This is illustrated in the sketch below:

2.1.8 The sketch shown the same radii linking the access road to The Vinery (6m) and The Vinery to the A27 (20m), reducing the width at the pedestrian crossing point to approximately 7.3m. In a reduction of the area to be constructed as new carriageway and a reduction in land take from the property to the west of The Vinery.

- 3.1.1 The proposal to improve the junction is broadly acceptable in its compliance with highway standards, subject to the improvement of sight lines within the visibility envelope by the removal of vegetation from the existing verge.
- 3.1.2 A suggestion to reduce the width of The Vinery has been put forward for consideration, that will reduce the width of the road on the approach to the junction and reduce the pedestrian and cycle crossing point.
- 3.1.3 An NMU context report is required in connection with the relocated crossing point.