WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL **DATE: 11th December 2012**
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION

FROM: **Tim Townsend** **TO:** **Arun District Council**
FAO: **Peter Cleveland**

SUBJECT: **A/82/12 - Residential development comprising 150 x dwellings including 30% affordable with access, landscaping, open space & associated works (this application is a Departure from the Development Plan).**

LOCATION: **Land East Of, Roundstone Lane, Angmering, West Sussex, BN16 4AL**

CONSULTATION DATE: **19TH November 2012**

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice	X	**Modification**		**More Information**	X
Objection		**No Objection**		**Refusal**	

S106 contribution: £807,960 (does not include any highway requirements, as yet to be agreed)

This is the third WSCC Highways and Transport response to the planning application and follows comments made on 6th September 2012 and 30th November 2012. This report replaces the report of 30th November 2012. Although similar to that earlier report, for ease of reading all changes are shown in red text.

Summary position of Highway Authority.
As submitted, there is insufficient information to enable the Highway Authority to fully consider the application. Key areas where further information is required are as follows (please read in-conjunction with main text of this Report for full details):

- Traffic impact (including TRICS analysis)
- Road Safety Audit
- Design Audit
- Sustainable access
- Internal layout
- Travel Plan
- S106 contributions
- Drainage

Given that the proposal is a full application, all points raised will need to be satisfactorily answered in advance of any further report being issued by the Highway Authority to the Local Planning Authority.

Junction assessments.
Previous comments made by the Highway Authority said that the junction assessments did not appear to be consistent with observed traffic conditions on the A259 or at Water Lane/A283. Further details have been provided on the junction assessments, including a plan showing ARCADY geometric dimensions, albeit at the junction of Roundstone Lane with A259 Littlehampton Road only.

ARCADY assessments have been provided for the following junctions:

- A259 New Road/Roundstone By-Pass with Station Road.
- A259 Roundstone By-Pass with B2225 Roundstone Lane.
- A259 Roundstone By-Pass/Littlehampton Road with A280 Angmering By-Pass.

Queue length assessments have been provided for the following junctions:

- Arundel Road with Station Road.
- High Street with Station Road.
- A280 Angmering By-Pass with Water Lane.
- Weavers Hill with Water Lane.

Previously, WSCC requested that the applicant explain the relationship between observed congestion and the technical junction assessments at both A259 Littlehampton Road/Roundstone Lane and A280/Water Lane junctions.

Responding to the A280/Water Lane junction, the applicant's highway consultant has stated that any congestion here is likely caused by the traffic calming feature on Water Lane causing queues, and not the junction itself being over capacity. The additional survey reports found in Appendix 1 of the consultant's response of 23rd November 2012 shows that the greatest queue was 7 vehicles waiting in the turning lane on the A280 Angmering By-Pass (waiting to turn into Water Lane). The capacity of the turning lane appears to be 10-11 vehicles. The Highway Authority observed the junction on the morning of the 27th November 2012 and although saw that some queuing on Water Lane as a result of the traffic calming was evident, the observations concurred with the findings in the applicant's Report. What is not clear, however, are the plans showing the observed queue lengths, found in Appendix 1 (in front of the revised survey sheets). In particular, it is not known what the red figures represent. As such, the applicant should explain these and provide adequate annotation on the plans.

The junction of the A259 with Roundstone Lane appears to have a narrow exit arm from Roundstone Lane which appears to reduce capacity on the arm, particularly when large vehicles attempt to leave Roundstone Lane to join the A259. Some overriding of the grass verge on the nearside of the northern arm is evident in the form of tyre track markings. Further information has been provided by the applicant's highway consultant, including a video survey on the junction functioning in the peak periods. On-site observation (during the am peak period on 27th November 2012 by the Highway Authority) revealed a maximum queue on the northern arm of Roundstone Lane of approximately 9 No. vehicles, albeit brought about because a coach was observed straddling the white lines at the junction. Average queues observed by the Highway Authority were approximately 4 vehicles during the am peak which is higher than the recordings in Appendix 1 of the aforementioned Technical Report of 23rd November 2012. Vehicles were observed getting away from the junction relatively quickly as gaps on the roundabout became available regularly.

Turning to the surveys and the revised ARCADY assessments provided in the Technical Report, some discrepancies were found, particularly with the ARCADY reports for the Roundstone Lane/Littlehampton Road (A259). In particular, the dimensions inputted to the ARCADY programme were different to those set out on Drawing No. 110 produced by the consultant. This should be corrected and the ARCADY re-run for this junction. Furthermore, drawings should also be provided for the A280/Littlehampton Road (A259) and Station Road/Littlehampton Road junctions with ARCADY re-run for these junctions, in order that the Highway Authority can check these as well.

When available, the Highway Authority will consider the required additional information further.

Assessment of the site access junction (Appendix 3 of the Technical Note), reveals that the junction should operate within capacity. However, it is not known what junction arrangement this is based on. The applicant should confirm this point, showing a detailed plan with dimensions marked on it.

TRICS analysis.
Further TRICS analysis should be undertaken by the applicant and provided to the Highway Authority to consider. Traffic distribution should also be shown.

Site access junction.
Concern was expressed previously that the proposed configuration of the junction did not relate well to the existing traffic calming on Roundstone Lane. As such, the applicant's Highway Consultant was asked to provide a revised access arrangement including a feature to replace the current chicane/build-out on Roundstone Lane. A Design Audit, new/revised Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response were also requested.

The previous Road Safety Audit made the following observation:

"Despite traffic calming features on Roundstone Lane it was noted by the Audit Team that many vehicles were proceeding at inappropriate speeds for this class and type of road."

This implied that the existing traffic calming is not effective and the proposed raised table at the site access junction would not appear to introduce a feature which would reduce speeds on Roundstone Lane.

The original scheme was implemented to discourage through-traffic rather than as a casualty or speed reduction measure. It is, however, noteworthy that there have been no reported personal injury accidents along this stretch in the most up-to-date three years. Subject to satisfactory design, Safety Audit and approval by County Local Committee, the raised table would essentially be a replacement feature to maintain the overall integrity of the existing traffic calming measures along Roundstone Lane. Furthermore, evidence has been provided showing existing vehicle speeds on Roundstone Lane at or near the site access. These are found in the highway consultant's "Review of Roundstone Lane Traffic Calming" Report of July 2012. In summary these show that the highest 85th% tile speed along Roundstone Lane in the vicinity of the site was 33.1mph with average speeds of mid-late 20mph, close to the prescribed 30mph speed limit.

The site access junction itself should be provided with sight lines corresponding to the wet weather 85% tile speed (the applicant should clarify whether the figures quoted are west or dry speeds). Manual for Streets (MfS) Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) will inform the length of visibility splays required at the junction. The needs of pedestrians, cyclists and mobility-impaired people should also be considered within the junction design. Consideration must also be given to the location of existing access points (Flint Cottage being one).

In addition to the modelling of the site access junction, the applicant should also provide PICADY assessment at the junctions of Roundstone Lane south of the site (both the 'T' junction and roundabout). The junction of High Street with Water Lane should also be considered in capacity terms. Clear plans showing the peak hour impacts at these junctions should be provided.

The proposed retaining structures at the junction will require "Approval in Principle" before they can be constructed as part of a Section 278 highway agreement. While this is not required for any planning consent, the applicant should ensure that it is feasible to construct the structures within existing or proposed highway land. Please confirm what the features are.

Site sustainability.
As stated in the Highway Authority's response of 6th September 2012, a network of roads and paths to the west of the site and Public Rights of Way (PROW) along the east and south sides of the site have been observed. The only bus service adjacent to the site is the 9 between Lancing &

Littlehampton which passes along Roundstone Lane. Local amenities are said to be within a short walk of the site.

Further information found in the highway consultant's Report of 23rd November 2012 suggests a number of local transport infrastructure proposals. At this stage, it is not known in what detail these have been prepared, nor is it clear what has informed these changes to the surrounding network. With regard to current infrastructure (specifically for walking, cycling and bus access), a footway runs along the western side of Roundstone Lane which is continuous through to Angmering Village (approximately 10-15 minutes walk away) – albeit with some gradients in places. Access via this footway southwards to local schools via the new estates to the south-west of the site is also available. Access via footpaths would be available via the PROW to the south and east of the site although final details are not shown.

No footway is available on the eastern (site) side of Roundstone Lane. Pedestrians would, therefore, be encouraged to cross adjacent to the site access junction. As such, a footway should be considered along the eastern (site) side of Roundstone Lane. This would have the potential to provide a level footway in and out of the site to both local bus stops and back to Angmering Village. As stated elsewhere in this Report, the footway on the western side of the road, close to Weavers Ring, has a section with a gradient for those travelling northwards which may not be wholly suitable for all highway users. With regard to bus stop improvements, the applicant should confirm that bus stops will be provided with real-time passenger information and, where possible, shelters and seating. The applicant should respond further on these points and demonstrate suitable links to existing paths and footways for access to goods, services, facilities and public transport.

Travel Plan.
The applicant has been provided with advice in relation to Travel Plan requirements for the site. However, a detailed response to this (including costs allocated to the measures required and confirmation of the measures agreed) is still required.

Internal road layout.
The following points should be addressed by the applicant (comments arising from scrutiny of Urban Design Drawing No. ST-02-12B – applicant should confirm that this is the most up-to-date plan):

1. First private access points within the estate layout adjacent to the junction with Roundstone Lane should be moved away from the junction area. As shown, they are too close and there is the risk that collisions may take place.
2. Further detail of the bellmouth of the junction with Roundstone Lane should be shown. Width of access road (first 50 or so metres up to the 'divide in the internal layout) to be shown and full detail of footway. As shown at present, the detail is incomplete.
3. Sight line at junction of access road with Roundstone Lane to be shown following advice in MfS and based on recorded wet weather 85% tile speeds.
4. Flint walls adjacent to the back edge of footways to be maximum height of 0.6m to maintain pedestrian intervisibility. The other alternative would be for the walls to be lowered to 0.6m for 2.4 x 2m intervisibility splays either side of vehicular access points or the walls tapered back on an angle to provide the splays.
5. Please confirm whether the block paved areas on the internal roadways are to be raised or flush.
6. Please confirm tree types shown planted in verge areas. Please note that commuted sums for planted areas may be required.
7. Please provide road adoption plan (or plan showing that intended to be offered for adoption).
8. Driveways for plot's 4 and 148 come in on the ends of the 'ramps' for the block paved areas. These should be moved so they join on the 'flat'. (This comment may not be relevant if block paved areas are proposed to be flush).

9. Pedestrian intervisibility splays to be shown alongside each private driveway at the back edge of footway and/or service margin.
10. Manual for Streets (MfS) splays to be shown at main access junctions throughout the development.
11. Please clearly indicate what is to be footway and what is to be verge.
12. The first POS area – will drivers be able to see across this when driving to and from the 'divide' in the road?
13. Motorcycle parking to be shown (residents and visitors).
14. Disabled parking provision to be shown (residents and visitors).
15. Please confirm internal garage dimensions – need to be 3m x 6m in accordance with MfS.
16. Parking for plots 132 and 133 appears to be over-generous. Please reduce in-line with recommended guidance.
17. Tracking of large service vehicles to be shown throughout estate to be shown (including junction with Roundstone Lane).
18. Parking for plot 138 is poorly situated with regard to the dwelling. This could encourage occupiers to park on-street. Please re-configure the layout to bring parking closer to the plot.
19. Cycle provision to be shown (residents and visitors).
20. Parking for plot 143 would be improved with garage brought in-line with houses and the other two spaces allocated to 143 positioned side by side. The adjacent turning head to be extended slightly to accommodate.
21. Parking for plots 17 and 18 should be provided alongside properties.
22. Manoeuvring at rear of parking spaces for plots 14 and 15 too tight. Needs to be increased to 6.5m.
23. Plot 13 – only 1 No. parking space appears to be shown. Please provide to standard.
24. Turning head adjacent to plot 31 should be shown extended to improve turning at this end.
25. Plots 46 and 47 – trees shown in access road and access details unclear.
26. Plot 87 – Replace garage with parking space in case garage is not used so close to the road junction (will discourage on-street parking at this point).
27. Plot 55 – parking should be put alongside/adjacent to plot.
28. Plots 57 and 58 – parking poorly located and is likely to lead to parking on access road. Needs to be better-related to properties it is serving.
29. Parking court to rear of plots 63, 64, 66 and 67 – manoeuvring area to be enlarged to 6.5m.
30. Further details of access to plot 79 required.
31. Manoeuvring within parking court for plots 69-71 and 68-72 to be enlarged to measure 6.5m.
32. Driveway/access details for plots 92-94 to be shown.
33. Parking space alongside plot 129 needs to measure 6.0m.
34. Visitor laybys to be provided throughout the development on parts of the main access roads (to maintain carriageway widths).
35. Please confirm that a fence will be provided around the play areas.
36. Please specify gradient of first 20m of access from the point it joins Roundstone Lane. (Should not be greater than 1:30 for first 20m).
37. Access to "Pound Place" appears to be shown on the layout drawing. The applicant should confirm whether this is intended or just a drawing error.

For areas not being adopted/remaining private, a management company will be required, details of which will have to be secured in a S106 Agreement. Furthermore, a non-adoption clause will be required to be inserted in the S106 for those areas of roadway not being offered for adoption/remaining private.

Construction Management Plan.
Whilst a detailed Plan is not required at this stage, further details of the traffic management aspects of construction, including vehicle routing and parking, should be provided.

S106.
Details of non-highways requirements found at the foot of this report.

Highways considerations put forward by the applicant are as follows:

- Pedestrian crossing improvements in the form of tactile paving and dropped kerbs – Rectory Lane; Water Lane (2 No. locations); High Street; High Street and Weavers Ring.
- Possible footway, Weavers Hill.
- Bus stop improvements in the form of shelters (where possible); real-time passenger displays; seating.
- Financial contribution towards A259 Route Study.

As documented above, it is not known what has informed the above. The applicant should respond to this and give details of where this information has come from and what design work has been undertaken to demonstrate that these can be achieved. Further highway requirements may emerge when replies to this Report are available.

Public Rights of Way (PROW).
Connections to the formal PROW network are shown on the layout drawings. Connections are shown to the south to Public Footpath 2145 (1 No. point) and to the east to Public Byway 3605 (2 No. points). Neither PROW is actually contained within the site itself so should not be adversely impacted upon. However, actual detail should be specified, please.

Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) – Traffic calming.
In addition to actual technical design and the planning process, the access arrangements require changes to be made to part of the existing scheme of traffic calming on Roundstone Lane. This requires support from the local community, emergency services, bus companies etc. and County Local Committee. WSCC policy requires that developers need to demonstrate community involvement and acceptance through consultation at the preliminary design stage; consultation that needs to be concluded in advance of the application being heard at Planning Committee. To date, this does not appear to have been done and is required to inform both highway design and subsequent response thereto from the Highway Authority. The process would have to be carried out at the applicant's expense. All changes, if agreed, would have to be tied-into a S106 Agreement. The entire TRO process would have to be finalised and agreed prior to **any** works commencing, both on and off-site **and** prior to any application for S38/278 works being submitted. Full details of the process can be found on the WSCC website.

WSCC Fire and Rescue Service (WSFRS).
The general overview of the site layout plan is that there are unlikely to be any major issues that cannot be resolved.

Housing is of a greater density from the entrance, with tree-lined avenues. The main entrance road splits and rejoins by a paved area across the back so the WSFRS has two routes into the heart of the development. The only concern would be if the density of on street parking is increased but no provision for parking on the roadway (e.g. road too narrow) unless more detailed plans indicate otherwise*. This could be overcome by ensuring that if parking is required it is restricted to one side and the road is of a sufficient width to allow a fire appliance to pass. The southern part of the development is more spacious with a lesser chance of on-street congestion. WSFRS is, therefore, satisfied that it has adequate access from a single entrance point If the first point is addressed in the design.

We will require 4 hydrants on this development (positions to be agreed with WSFRS).

(*Additional on-street visitor parking has been requested – see internal layout comments above).

Drainage.
The applicant should provide details of how the site will be drained.

Conclusion.
Further information is required to enable the Highway Authority to fully consider the proposals. Please re-consult when additional information is available, at which time the Highway Authority will consider the application further.

In the absence of satisfactory information and adequate time to go through it, a highway objection would be raised to the proposals.

Tim Townsend
Strategic Planning

(S106 – sans TAD/highway requirements – found below):-

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DIVISION: SECTION 106 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

DATE: 19.09.2012

FROM: Adam Charlton, Monitoring and Records

TO: Matthew Bartle, Planning Applications Team

DISTRICT/BOROUGH COUNCIL: Arun

Application Number: A/82/12

The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to Development at Land East Of, Roundstone Lane, Angmering, West Sussex, BN16 4AL

Planning Application details - Residential development comprising 150 x dwellings including 30% affordable with access, landscaping, open space & associated works (this application is a Departure from the Development Plan).

Education			
Locality	Angmering		
Population Adjustment	258.9		
	Primary	Secondary	6th Form
Child Product	3.6012	3.6012	1.9446
Total Places Required	25.2084	18.0060	3.8893
Library			
Locality	Angmering		
Contribution towards Angmering / Arundel / East Preston / Ferring / Findon Valley	£34,796		
Contribution towards Rustington / Willowhale	£0		
Contribution towards Bognor Regis / Littlehampton	£0		
Population Adjustment	258.9		
Sqm per population	35		
Sqm Required	9.06		
Waste			
Adjusted Net. Households	105		
Fire			
No. Hydrants	TBC		
Population Adjustment	258.9		
£/head of additional population	£13		
TAD- Transport			
Net Population Increase	0.0		
Net Parking Spaces	0		
Net Commercial Floor Space sqm	0		
Total Access (commercial only)	0.0000		

Summary of Contributions

S106 type	Monies Due
Education - Primary	£330,608
Education - Secondary	£355,835
Education - 6th Form	£83,355
Libraries	£34,796
Waste	No contribution required
Fire & Rescue	£3,366
No. of Hydrants	TBC
TAD	£0
Total Contribution	**£807,960**

The above contributions are required pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 to mitigate the impacts of the subject proposal with the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

Planning obligations requiring the above money is understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined by the in the *National Planning Policy Framework, 2012***.**

The basis for this advice is contained in the County Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document "The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1".

All TAD (Total Access Demand) contributions have been calculated in accordance with the stipulated local threshold and the methodology adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in November 2003.

The calculations have been derived on the basis of an increase in 150 Net dwellings

Further to the monetary contributions The County Fire Officer advises that the proposed development may need to include the provision of fire hydrants connected to adequate supplies of water for fire fighting (Contact: David Boarer – Fire Services 01243 813667). It should also include suitable access for fire brigade vehicles and equipment.

Please see below for a Breakdown and explanation of the WSCC Contribution Calculators. Also see the attached spreadsheet for the breakdown of the calculation figures. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106).

Deed of Planning Obligations

a) As a deed of planning obligations would be required to ensure payment of the necessary financial contribution, the County Council would require the proposed development to reimburse its reasonable legal fees incurred in the preparation of the deed.

b) The deed would provide for payment of the financial contribution upon commencement of the development.

c) In order to reflect the changing costs, the deed would include arrangements for review of the financial contributions at the date the payment is made if the relevant date falls after 31st March 2013.

d) Review of the contributions towards school building costs should be by reference to the DfF adopted Primary/Secondary/Further Secondary school building costs applicable at the date of payment of the contribution and where this has not been published in the financial year in which the contribution has been made then the contribution should be index linked to the DfE cost multiplier and relevant increase in the RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

e) Review of the contribution towards the provision of additional library floorspace should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

f) Review of the contribution towards the provision of fire service infrastructure (fire stations) should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Recent experience suggests that where a change in contributions required in relation to a development or the necessity for indexation of financial contributions from the proposed development towards the costs of providing service infrastructure such as libraries is not specifically set out within recommendations approved by committee, applicants are unlikely to agree to such provisions being included in the deed itself. Therefore, it is important that your report and recommendations should cover a possible change in requirements and the need for appropriate indexation arrangements in relation to financial contributions.

Please ensure that applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and thus 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.

Please see below for a Breakdown of the Contribution Calculators for clarification of West Sussex County Council's methodology in calculating Contributions. Also see the attached spreadsheet for the breakdown of the calculation figures. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106).

Breakdown of Contribution Calculation Formulas:

1. School Infrastructure Contributions

The financial contributions for school infrastructure are broken up into three categories (primary, secondary, sixth form). Depending on the existing local infrastructure only some or none of these categories of education will be required. Where the contributions are required the calculations are based on the additional amount of children and thus school places that the development would generate (shown as **TPR- Total Places Required**). The TPR is then multiplied by the Department for Children, Schools and Families school building costs per pupil place (**cost multiplier**).

School Contributions = TPR x cost multiplier

a) TPR- Total Places Required:

TPR is determined by the number of year groups in each school category multiplied by the child product.

TPR = (No of year groups) x (child product)

Year groups are as below:

- Primary school- **7** year groups (aged 4 to 11)
- Secondary School- **5** year groups (aged 11 to 16)
- Sixth Form School Places- **2** year groups (aged 16 to 18)

Child Product is the **adjusted education population** multiplied by average amount of children, taken to be 14 children per year of age per 1000 persons (average figure taken from 2001 Census).

Child Product = Adjusted Population x 14 / 1000

Note: The adjusted education population for the child product excludes population generated from 1 bed units, Sheltered and 55+ Age Restricted Housing and Social Rented Housing as a nil child product is assumed for these dwellings.

b) Cost multiplier- Education Services

The cost multiplier is a figure released by the Department for Education. It is a school building costs per pupil place as at 2012/2013, updated by Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors Building Cost Information Service All-In Tender Price Index. Each Cost multiplier is as below:

- Primary Schools- **£13,115 per child**
- Secondary Schools- **£19,762 per child**
- Sixth Form Schools- **£21,432 per child**

2. Library Infrastructure

There are two methodologies used for calculating library infrastructure Contributions. These have been locally tailored on the basis of required contributions and the nature of the library in the locality, as below:

Library infrastructure contributions are determined by the population adjustment resulting in a square metre demand for library services. The square metre demand is multiplied by a cost multiplier which determines the total contributions as below:

Contributions = SQ M Demand x Cost Multiplier

a) Square Metre Demand
The square metre demand for library floor space varies across the relevant districts and parishes on the basis of library infrastructure available and the settlement population in each particular locality. The **local floorspace demand (LFD)** figure varies between 30 and 35 square metres per 1000 people and is provided with each individual calculation.

Square Metre Demand = (Adjusted Population x LFD) / 1000

b) Cost Multiplier- Library Infrastructure
WSCC estimated cost of providing relatively small additions to the floorspace of existing library buildings is **£3,840** per square metre. This figure was updated by WSCC's Quantity surveyor for the 2012/2013 period.

3. Fire & Rescue Service Infrastructure

The Fire and Rescue Services infrastructure contribution is determined by the population adjustment multiplied by the relevant cost multiplier for the provision of services.

Fire and Rescue Contributions = Adjusted Population x Cost Multiplier

a) Adjusted Population
This is the sum of the occupancy rates for the net dwelling increase with the exclusion of social housing increase.

b) Cost Multiplier- Fire Rescue
There are two cost multipliers for WSCC which relate to the Southern Division and the Northern Division. The cost multiplier is calculated by dividing the total cost of necessary fire and rescue infrastructure within the division by the projected population for 2016. The cost multipliers are as below:

Southern Division (Chichester, Arun, Worthing and Adur): £13 per person

Northern Division (Horsham, Crawley, Mid Sussex): £50 per person in Horsham, £92 per person in Crawley

Note: The installation costs of fire hydrants are excluded from the above and will continue to be required on developments as a direct cost to the developer as required under the Fire Services Act 2004

4. TAD- Total Access Demand

The methodology is based on total access to and from a development. An **Infrastructure Contribution** is required in respect of each occupant or employee provided with a parking space, as they would be more likely to use the road infrastructure. The **Sustainable Transport Contribution** is required in respect of each occupant or employee not provided with a parking space which would be likely to rely on sustainable transport.

TAD = Infrastructure contribution + Sustainable Transport contribution

a) Infrastructure Contribution
Contributions for Infrastructure are determined by the net increase in car parking spaces, multiplied by WSCC's estimated cost of providing transport infrastructure per vehicle- Infrastructure cost multiplier. The Infrastructure cost multiplier as at 2012/2013 is £1,000 per parking space.

Infrastructure contributions = Car parking spaces x Cost multiplier.

b) Sustainable Transport Contribution

This is derived from the net car parking increase subtracted from the projected increase in occupancy of the development. The sustainable transport contribution increases where the population is greater than the parking provided. The sustainable transport figure is then multiplied by County Council's estimated costs of providing sustainable transport infrastructure cost multiplier (£500).

Sustainable transport contr. = (net car parking – occupancy) x 500

Note: occupancy is determined by projected rates per dwelling and projected people per commercial floorspace as determined by WSCC.

cc: **David Boarer, WSCC Fire Services (via email)**
Deborah Lewis, WSCC Library Services (via email)
Lyndsay Irvine, WSCC Children and Young People's Services (via email)