

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

DATE: 13th February 2013

**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	☒	Modification	☐	More Information	☒
Objection	☐	No Objection	☐	Refusal	☐

S106 contribution: £TBA

This is the fourth WSCC Highways and Transport response to the planning application and follows comments made on 6th September 2012, 30th November 2012 and 11th December 2012.

Summary position of Highway Authority.

Further information was submitted to the Highway Authority in order to consider the application further. Key areas where further information was required was 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

Traffic impact assessment.

The applicant proposes a development of 150 homes. A Transport Assessment (TA) accompanies the planning application. This sets out what the daily and peak hour impacts of the development would be, and where those impacts are likely to occur. ARCADY and PICADY assessments are included which specifically model roundabouts and road junctions respectively.

However, the assessment only considers the development of 150 homes. Given that other applications are current (195 and 38 homes, soon to be followed by up to 220 homes and a further SHLAA site of 100 homes). Arun District Council has decided that the applicants should, alongside the consultants preparing traffic impact assessments for the 195 and 38 homes, consider the **cumulative** impact of up to 618 homes following advice contained in WSCC TA Methodology. Copies can be found on the WSCC website. Both WSCC and Arun District Council would like all of the applicants to work together to provide this assessment.

When this information is available the Highway Authority will consider the proposal further.

Site access junction.

The access design still requires further amendments, namely:

- Sight lines to be shown at all adjacent access points onto Roundstone Lane
- Sight lines commensurate with 85th wet weather speed of traffic on Roundstone Lane
- Bellmouth radius (southern edge) to be increased to prevent swept path of car from crossing centreline of Roundstone Lane
- Bus shelter locations to be located clear of sight line splays (including areas where pedestrians might wait). PLEASE NOTE THAT WSCC IS CURRENTLY UNDERTAKING A SAFETY ASSESSMENT OF THE BUS STOP POSITIONS AND FURTHER COMMENTS WILL FOLLOW.

The applicant should refer back to the Road Safety Audit team revised drawings including the comments made above and seek their further comments.

If retaining structures are proposed at the junction, they 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. 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. In the CEP reply of 12th December 2012, further information is provided. However, to conclude matters on this element alone, firm commitments to penalties (if TP targets are not met) and to SAM surveys required. Additionally, links to Travel Plans for neighbouring sites should be considered.

Internal road layout.

The following points are still required to be responded to 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. 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.
2. Please confirm whether the block paved areas on the internal roadways are to be raised or flush.
3. Please confirm tree types shown planted in verge areas. Please note that commuted sums for planted areas may be required.
4. Please provide road adoption plan (or plan showing that intended to be offered for adoption).
5. 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).
6. Pedestrian intervisibility splays to be shown alongside each private driveway at the back edge of footway and/or service margin.
7. Manual for Streets (MfS) splays to be shown at main access junctions throughout the development.
8. Please clearly indicate what is to be footway and what is to be verge.
9. The first POS area – will drivers be able to see across this when driving to and from the 'divide' in the road?
10. Motorcycle parking to be shown (residents and visitors).
11. Disabled parking provision to be shown (residents and visitors).
12. Please confirm internal garage dimensions – need to be 3m x 6m in accordance with MfS.
13. Parking for plots 132 and 133 appears to be over-generous. Please reduce in-line with recommended guidance.
14. Tracking of large service vehicles to be shown throughout estate to be shown (including junction with Roundstone Lane).
15. 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.
16. Cycle provision to be shown (residents and visitors).
17. 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.
18. Parking for plots 17 and 18 should be provided alongside properties.
19. Manoeuvring at rear of parking spaces for plots 14 and 15 too tight. Needs to be increased to 6.5m.
20. Plot 13 – only 1 No. parking space appears to be shown. Please provide to standard.
21. Turning head adjacent to plot 31 should be shown extended to improve turning at this end.
22. Plots 46 and 47 – trees shown in access road and access details unclear.
23. 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).
24. Plot 55 – parking should be put alongside/adjacent to plot.
25. 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.
26. Parking court to rear of plots 63, 64, 66 and 67 – manoeuvring area to be enlarged to 6.5m.
27. Further details of access to plot 79 required.
28. Manoeuvring within parking court for plots 69-71 and 68-72 to be enlarged to measure 6.5m.
29. Driveway/access details for plots 92-94 to be shown.

30. Parking space alongside plot 129 needs to measure 6.0m.
31. Visitor laybys to be provided throughout the development on parts of the main access roads (to maintain carriageway widths).
32. Please confirm that a fence will be provided around the play areas.
33. 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).
34. 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.

Contributions towards WSCC infrastructure will be required. Details to follow separately. Final details of highway requirements to be determined following assessment of joint modelling and consideration of cumulative impact of nearby proposals.

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; Weavers Ring and A259 (adjacent to A280 Angmering By-Pass).
- 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.

In previous correspondence the Highway Authority asked what had informed the above. The applicant has responded stating that the measures were simply items discussed and that there is no commitment to providing them (other than the shelters and seating). The Highway Authority has already stated that access to and from key locations has not been fully demonstrated and as such the development should provide for improvements at certain locations to provide for greater accessibility by modes other than the private car.

Other S106 highways considerations.

- Cycle parking at Angmering railway station
- Angmering Village traffic management
- Shared pedestrian/cycle route – A259 between South Drive and Station Road and along Roundstone Lane
- Junction improvements – A280 Angmering By-pass/Water Lane
- Options Appraisal Study – investigate improvements to the vehicular access serving Angmering railway station
- Footway along eastern side of Roundstone Lane
- Evening and Sunday bus services
- Improvements to existing PROW and connectivity between sites and existing development in Angmering
- improved safety and cycle routes for cyclists, specifically along Arundel Road and Station Road.

Further highway requirements/mitigation (e.g. road and junction improvements etc.) will be determined from cumulative assessment of the Angmering developments referred to above.

Commitment to a combined package of highway measures (alongside developers of adjacent sites) is required from the applicant.

Public Rights of Way (PROW).

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

For the combined developments, a link through all of the sites, including links to BOAT 3605 should be shown for pedestrians and cyclists, including upgrading of the surface. An upgrading of Public Footpaths 2127 and 2145 to provide for pedestrian and cycle use should also form part of any mitigation package secured. Please note that the section of 2145 running parallel to BOAT 3605 and the A280 Angmering By-Pass should remain as a footpath given that access by bicycle could be achieved using the BOAT. Appropriate access controls must be included in the overall design to prevent unauthorised use of either routes.

Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) – traffic calming alterations.

It is reiterated that 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.

It is strongly recommended that consultation begins now.

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.

WSFRS 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.

Tim Townsend
Strategic Planning