

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Patrick Arthurs/David Easton
FROM:	WSCC - Highway Authority
DATE:	19 July 2022
LOCATION:	Barnham, Eastergate, Westergate BEW Parcel SC1 Barnham
SUBJECT:	BN/11/22/OUT Outline application with all matters reserved (except for the A29 Realignment) for the demolition of existing structures and mixed use development to provide residential dwellings (Use Class C3), Care Home/Senior Living Accommodation (Use Class E/F2/Sui Generis), a Primary School plus open space, landscaping, drainage and all other associated ancillary works; and realignment of the A29 and early connection to existing A29 including construction of a new road carriageway, junctions and associated infrastructure. This application also lies within the parish of Aldingbourne, affects the setting of listed buildings, affects the character & appearance of the Eastergate Church Lane Conservation Area and affects a Public Right of Way. This application is the subject of an Environmental Statement. An amendment received. More information received from Patrick Arthur's email.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	31 March 2022
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	TBA

Please see email from Tim Townsend (WSCC) to Patrick Arthurs/David Easton (Arun DC) of 19 July 2022.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services

Topic	PF Response																											
WSCC commence dated 10 th May 2022																												
Cycle track width to be widened to provide for two-way flows on both sides of the new road	Our design currently has a 2m cycleway either side alongside the footway which in accordance with LTN 1/20 allows for a maximum of flow of cycles at 200 per peak hour, see extract below: Table 5-2: Cycle lane and track widths <table><tr><th>Cycle Route Type</th><th>Direction</th><th>Peak hour cycle flow (either one way or two-way depending on cycle route type)</th><th>Desirable minimum width (m)</th><th>Absolute minimum at constraints (m)</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">Protected space for cycling (including light segregation, stepped cycle track, kerbed cycle track)</td><td rowspan="3">1 way</td><td><200</td><td>2.0</td><td>1.5</td></tr><tr><td>200-800</td><td>2.2</td><td>2.0</td></tr><tr><td>>800</td><td>2.5</td><td>2.0</td></tr><tr><td rowspan="3"></td><td rowspan="3">2 way</td><td><300</td><td>3.0</td><td>2.0</td></tr><tr><td>>300-1000</td><td>3.0</td><td>2.5</td></tr><tr><td>>1000</td><td>4.0</td><td>3.0</td></tr></table> We anticipate less than 200 cycles per hour. <i>The 2.0m widths are absolute minimum widths and should only be used when there are constraints – which there don't appear to be here. Therefore, 3.0m paths should be provided both sides for the cycle component of the paths. 2.0m footways should be run alongside with the step in-between.</i> PF drawing A13394-PF-ZZ-XX-DR-CD-00001 P05 shows a physical delineation strip between footway and cycleway. A step can be incorporated but not specifically required and will complicate the drainage provisions along the footway/cycleway. If this is a WSCC design requirement it can be included as part of the Detailed Design without changing the principals of the design. <i>See comments above – a stepped demarcation should be provided and drainage designed accordingly.</i> On the main routes (at the roundabout intersections) we have shown a 3m wide combined footway/cycleway. For the minor connections cycle routes will be developed alongside the plot design if required. This information will be submitted as part of the relevant reserved matters applications for the plots.	Cycle Route Type	Direction	Peak hour cycle flow (either one way or two-way depending on cycle route type)	Desirable minimum width (m)	Absolute minimum at constraints (m)	Protected space for cycling (including light segregation, stepped cycle track, kerbed cycle track)	1 way	<200	2.0	1.5	200-800	2.2	2.0	>800	2.5	2.0		2 way	<300	3.0	2.0	>300-1000	3.0	2.5	>1000	4.0	3.0
Cycle Route Type	Direction	Peak hour cycle flow (either one way or two-way depending on cycle route type)	Desirable minimum width (m)	Absolute minimum at constraints (m)																								
Protected space for cycling (including light segregation, stepped cycle track, kerbed cycle track)	1 way	<200	2.0	1.5																								
		200-800	2.2	2.0																								
		>800	2.5	2.0																								
	2 way	<300	3.0	2.0																								
		>300-1000	3.0	2.5																								
		>1000	4.0	3.0																								
A 'step' shown to differentiate foot and cycle components of the paths referred to in point 1 above should be shown.																												
No continuation of cycle routes is shown into the side roads.																												

	<i>As stated in previous comments, the side roads running off the new A29 are included in the red edging and as such, WSCC need to see the continuation of the paths at this current planning stage.</i>
--	--

Central islands preventing right hand turns. These appear to be very narrow and may lead to signs being hit by vehicles on either-end and may, in practice, lead to higher traffic speeds past them. And, no rationale is provided as to why they are proposed. Applicant to look to provide right hand turning lanes instead for the locations where the central 'barriers' are shown.	The central island physical widths are 1.5m and therefore a sign can be centrally located (for example a left turn only sign) with a 0.45mm offset from the kerb edge. Additionally, the proposed 1040 hatch markings which add another 1m either side provide additional protection. During initial discussions with Arun District Council and West Sussex County Council the team were advised to minimise full access junctions to maintain throughput of traffic. Therefore, under the direction of WSCC we provided central roundabouts linking through traffic and limiting side road traffic to left-in/left-out. <i>The creation of all-movement junctions will help with permeability and may have a slowing effect on traffic speeds which could (alongside other mitigation) assist with pursuing a 30mph speed limit along the length of the new A29 road. The other option might be to re-design as roundabouts, thereby introducing further 'breaks' in traffic flow and speeds.</i>
The access to the industrial/commercial facility north of roundabout (Lidsey Farm) is not clearly shown, nor does it appear to have been considered in the Road Safety Audit, nor tracked for the size and type of vehicles that use it. As the kerb line is being altered and given its proximity to the new roundabout on Lidsey Road, this information must be provided, please.	The existing access to Lidsey Farm is to be maintained and is reflected on the submitted highways plans. A visibility splay of 41m can currently be achieved in land which is either public highway or land owned/ the existing access /controlled by The Southern Consortium. Please see attached drawing A13394-SK034. <i>As-per CHA previous comments, this needs looking at in more detail, including having it tracked for a selection of vehicles (including HGVs) and safety audited in its revised guise. *Please also see comments elsewhere in this response to do with proposed speed limit changes at this location.</i>
No detail is shown of the transition of the roundabout on existing A29 and the existing right hand turning lane, also on existing A29 (the latter serving the waste site). This point has also been picked up in the submitted Road Safety Audit.	Please find attached a revised version of drawing A13394-PF-ZZ-XX-DR-CD-00107 incorporating the existing Ghost Island junction on south of the proposed Hanbury Link Roundabout serving the waste site. <i>Until the design speed is discussed and settled, it would be difficult to take a view on how to consider geometric parameters – whether to consider them as based on a design speed of 30mph or the existing 50mph.</i> <i>The designers will need to carry out a design audit to demonstrate that the resultant ghost island to the landfill site remains within the requirements of CD 123. From a cursory look, it looks unlikely that the ghost island geometric parameters will meet the requirements and so the designers will need to decide how to progress it if it doesn't.</i> <i>The stagger distance between the proposed roundabout and the landfill junction will also need to be looked at in terms of compliance with standards.</i> <i>Applicant to set-out what design speed this has been designed to.</i>
Roundabout referred to in point 7 above should be tracked for a selection of vehicles including HGVs.	Please see attached drawing A13394-PF-ZZ-TR-DR-CD-00002 which shows tracking of HGV's on the existing A29 and Refuse vehicle tracking accessing Hanbury Link <i>The roundabout appears to have been constructed to minimum tolerances as the track of articulated vehicles comes very close to the kerb lines. However, until the design speed is</i>

	<i>discussed and settled, it would be difficult to take a view on how to consider geometric parameters – whether to consider them as based on the design speed of 30mph or the existing 50mph.</i> <i>The designers will need to carry out a design audit to demonstrate that the resultant ghost island to the landfill site remains within the requirements of CD 123. From a cursory look, it looks unlikely that the ghost island geometric parameters will meet the requirements and so the designers will need to decide how to progress it if it doesn't.</i> <i>The stagger distance between the proposed roundabout and the landfill junction will also need to be looked at in terms of compliance with standards.</i> <i>Applicant to set-out what design speed this has been designed to.</i>
Crossing points – There are a large number of crossing points shown – some controlled and some uncontrolled. Applicant to explain rationale behind them including type of crossing proposed, locations chosen and whether any informal ones are included?	As indicated in our previous response: Crossing point, both key and desirable have been considered and discussed at length with Officers to ensure connectivity across the site is included in the design. As shown on the drawings and in the DAS the site does contain some critical links and desire lines East/West which have been reflected in the layouts. Types of crossing point and their interaction with the proposed junction have been considered alongside the design standards. As part of the Design Statement Pell Frischmann provided Technical Note on the type of crossing and how this aligns with traffic volumes and design speed. Key links across the proposed A29 (away from junctions) have been primarily shown as Signal Control crossing points to ensure clear and controlled links across the site. <i>Further discussion is required with the applicant about this.</i>

PF response to previous WSCC Highways comments dated 10th May 2022 with latest WSCC Highways responses to those comments dated 19th July 2022

Speed limit of new A29.

The proposed layout of the new A29 road, as presented by the applicant, does not appear to comply with the WSCC Speed Limit Policy. As such, the applicant should look at implementing further measures and design alterations to the development proposal in order to make it fit for purpose and compliant with the Speed Limit Policy. The County Council as Highway Authority is keen to discuss this and all other associated matters to try to move this forward to a point where agreement can be reached.