

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Simon Davis
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	23 December 2019
LOCATION:	Land east of Shripney Road & south of Haddan House, Shripney Road, Bersted, PO22 9NW
SUBJECT:	BE/109/19/OUT Outline application with some matters reserved for up to 46 No dwellings together with access. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan. More information received.
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	provided separately

West Sussex County Council, in its capacity as Local Highway Authority (LHA), have been re-consulted on Outline application for 46 x dwellings with matters of access sought for approval.

In comments dated 21 November 2019 further information was requested with respect to the access arrangements including provision of Design Audit, Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA), consideration of pedestrian routes and location of refuge island and checking of junction modelling. The Transport Consultant has sought to address these outstanding issues as set out in following report.

RSA & Designers Response (DR)

A Stage 1 RSA has been carried out on the proposed access arrangements, to GG119 standards. The issues raised and DR have been summarised below:

2.1 - Risk of junction collisions due to lack of visibility

Auditor has raised that vehicles exiting proposed junction onto A29 may have obscured visibility due to foliage, increasing risk of junction collisions. Auditor recommends foliage removed and ensure sight lines maintained. DR states that foliage will be cut back and splays maintained. Full extent of visibility splays have now been demonstrated on drawing no. 1845 05 Rev B. The southern splay has been taken to the central island separating dual carriageway. Considering this physical feature prevents opposing traffic from overtaking, this approach is considered acceptable. To the north the splay has been taken to carriageway edge. ATC speed survey data has also been provided. Whilst 85th percentile speeds for northbound traffic appears to be 41.4mph, nevertheless this is in line with DMRB 70kph stopping sight distance requirement of 2.4m by 120m. It would be useful if location of speed counter was provided to ensure speeds recorded are reflective of site access position.

2.2 - Risk of conflict at junction due to inadequate space for larger vehicles to manoeuvre

Auditor has raised that larger vehicles encroach opposite carriageway when turning left out of junction or right in to access which could lead to conflict with vehicles waiting at junction. Auditor recommends junction reconfigured to allow larger vehicles to manoeuvre without encroaching on oncoming/waiting traffic. The DR states that access radii will be widened either side of access. The *Revised Proposed Site Access Arrangement* (drawing no. 1845 05 Rev B) shows widening of the bellmouth and increase southern kerb radii to 12m. The northern kerb radii has not been increased and remains at 6m. Whilst amended swept path plans have been provided showing that two refuse collection vehicles can pass in access and not cross carriageway, a Design Audit of the proposed access and right hand turn lane has not been provided. This should be

provided and include justification against standards for kerb radii on both sides and all other proposed highway modification/ junction works including right hand turn lane.

2.3 - Risk of increased severity of loss of control collisions due to southbound carriageway realignment

Auditor has raised that realignment of southbound carriageway will move road users closer to ditch on east side, increasing risk of vehicles ending up in ditch following loss of control collisions. Auditor recommends that a road restraint system is used to protect road users from falling in to ditch. The DR states that ditch will be culverted as part of access highway works - need for restraint systems will be discussed with LHA.

2.4 - Risk of pedestrian/vehicle conflict at proposed pedestrian crossing point (west side) due to vegetation

Auditor has raised that foliage obscures visibility at crossing when crossing west to east. It is recommended that foliage removed and sight lines permanently maintained. The DR states any vegetation obscuring visibility is result of encroachment to public highway and as such LHA can serve notice on properties where vegetation overhangs highway. Vegetation will be cut back as part of access highway works.

2.5 - Risk of pedestrian/vehicle conflict at proposed pedestrian crossing point (west side) due to low up stand of existing kerb

Auditor has raised that proposed pedestrian crossing point is at location where up stand of existing footway is insufficient increasing risk of vehicles mounting footway in location where pedestrians are encourage to cross. Auditor recommends that existing footway is reconstructed on west side to provide sufficient up stand. The DR states that kerb line works will be encompassed within detailed design stage.

2.6 - Risk of collision due to parked vehicles at proposed site access

Auditor has raised that if vehicles parked on proposed access road close to junction, vehicles turning in to site may collide with parked vehicles if entering at speed. Auditor recommends that 'No Waiting Restrictions' around junction are included. DR states that this can be considered by LHA at detailed design stage. Whether sufficient parking has been provided within the site will be assessed at reserved matters stage.

2.7 - Risk of pedestrian falls due to unprotected ditch

Auditor raises that road realignment will lead road users to drive closer to ditch and that pedestrians using new footway on east side of A29 may be at risk of falling in to ditch. Auditor recommends that appropriate protection for pedestrians is provided. DR states that double yellow line TRO (Traffic Regulation Order) will be considered at detailed design stage. The LHA is unclear as to how this will protect pedestrians from ditch and would expect DR to be similar to point 2.3, in that the ditch will be culverted.

The Designer should provided DR in format of table as shown in appendix F4 of GG119 so that LHA, as Overseeing Organisation, can fill out appropriate column. LHA also advise that amended plans, as result of RSA recommendations, are provided as part of DR document for completeness.

Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements

The LHA previously requested that a review of potential pedestrian desire lines and available/proposed crossing facilities is carried out and that they should consider locating the pedestrian refuge island to the south rather than to the north of the site.

The Transport Consultant states that an additional dropped kerb pedestrian crossing is proposed just after start of dual carriageway. The LHA raise concern with location of this across dual carriageway as pedestrians would effectively be required to cross two lane width at the point where vehicles may speed up to join dual carriageway. The crossing could be located just north of junction with Shripney Lane, within existing hatching. Relocation of proposed new crossing should also be reviewed by the safety auditor. Linking footway could also be provided along eastern carriageway edge to link with

existing footway and tie in to new pedestrian crossing location.

It has also been confirmed that informal pedestrian crossing north of access will not be a zebra crossing. As two new crossings are proposed the Transport Consultant has stated that pedestrians would not be reliant on crossing Shripney Lane and thus the existing crossing of this junction will not be improved. However, as the LHA have requested that the additional crossing be relocated so as to not cross dual carriageway, applicant should revisit any improvements that could be made to Shripney Lane junction crossing for pedestrians.

Road Network Capacity

The applicant was asked to confirm whether any nearby committed development was included within the junction capacity assessment for future years. They were also asked to alter the PICADY assessment to reflect modelling of right hand turn lane and provide turning count diagrams as well as explanation as to how development traffic has been distributed.

The planning consultant has confirmed that there are no specific committed developments that would not have been already accounted for within TEMPRO and the junction has been re-modelled with the correct inputs. A blocking queue of 6.0 PCUs has been used, broadly meeting with right hand turn lane length of 35 metres. The PICADY inputs show that right hand turn bay has been included with width of 3m. The outputs indicate that new junction will operate within capacity. Nevertheless, the Design Audit will assess whether the right hand turn lane is sufficient in length and width from a highway safety point of view, and consider such parameters as speed of vehicles merging in to lane.

Development traffic was previously split 50/50 north/south along A29. The split base has been altered to reflect actual traffic counts with 53% traffic northbound and 47% southbound during AM peak and 39% northbound and 61% southbound during PM peak. Flow diagrams of expected turning counts have been included. The LHA acknowledge provision of this and do not anticipate any 'severe' detrimental impact to capacity of new junction or nearby road network as a result of the development.

Conclusion

In summary there are a number of outstanding issues and modification requested, namely:

- Design Audit of all access works including new right hand turn lane
- DR provided in table format including readdressing point 2.7.
- Location of speed counter
- Relocate new proposed pedestrian crossing so that this does not cross dual carriageway and safety auditor to review this also

Please ask applicant for this additional information and re-consult.

Katie Kurek
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services