

BEW outstanding highway-related matters – 20/10/2022.

Proposed speed limit reduction for *existing* A29. Need to set out Departures from Standard and/or relaxations at both southern tie-in and Hanbury Link tie-in based on a 40mph road speed (do bear in mind that the 40mph isn't a 'given' at this stage but something that can be explored in connection with the proposed junctions being considered). Please show achievable visibility splays and geometry and document how these comply or don't comply with design standards. If the designs are changed, both junctions would need to be re-tracked.

For the Hanbury Link tie-in, we need to see better detail of the transition of the roundabout on existing A29 and the existing right hand turning lane which serves the landfill site. This point has also been picked up in the submitted Road Safety Audit. The designer will need to carry out a design audit to demonstrate how the resultant ghost island to the landfill site remains within the requirements of CD 123. Current tracking for large vehicles around this roundabout show that they run very close to the central island.

Access to Lidsey Farm – It needs to be demonstrated that this has been considered in the design and through the Safety Audit process. Visibility splays and swept-path analysis should be undertaken and provided for a selection of vehicles using the entrance (including HGVs).

For the proposed *new* A29, you should again explore a reduction in road width and other engineering measures to try to demonstrate how the road might be suitable for a 30mph speed limit. WSCC would not accept 'dragon's teeth', roundels on carriageway, rumble strips, central hatch markings. Double-lane approaches to RBTs should also be reviewed given proximity of crossing points. Recommend that a sample section of the road be provided for WSCC to consider.

The left-in/left-outs should, in WSCC's view, be all-movement right hand turning lanes to maximise connectivity and to have an influence on driver behaviour. WSCC consider that they (li-lo) do not assist with controlling traffic speeds – rather that they might lead to higher speeds.

Crossings (types, locations etc.), WSCC of the view that zebras (and zebra/style) are not suitable for main A29 but might be OK for side roads (subject to RSA responses being positive and design standards being met). Controlled (push-button) crossings should be provided at suitable locations along the new A29 alignment on/at key desire lines. Some uncontrolled crossings with refuges could be accepted for some parts. However, we still require a clear rationale for their locations. And please note earlier comment about double-lane exits and potential to 'mask' peds and/or cyclists crossing.

Details of cycle path tie-in's with side roads still required.

Travel Plan – Latest version being reviewed by WSCC. In previous correspondence from WSCC, we asked that the applicant review the WSCC Development Travel Plans Policy as the first version of the Travel Plan didn't appear to follow it. And that version didn't seem to reference promotion of lift sharing (e.g. through www.westsussexcarshare.com) or the provision of car club vehicles. The latter will be particularly important given that car clubs have the potential to 'unlock' use of non-car modes.

Structures. Regarding the routes under and over and noting the latest comments made, the response clarifies segregated routes over and shared under. As the applicant will know, LTN 1/20 prefers segregated whenever possible. Applicant to respond as to why the arrangements under the bridge travelling E-W (and vice-versa) are shown shared. If the arrangements underneath become segregated, it will mean that the bridge span grows as a result and the construction depth of the bridge will need to increase to cope with the extra span (and likewise, if the segregated routes over the bridge are widened). For the routes underneath, this will have knock-on effects to the height of the carriageway above the landscape and the length of the approaches. In any event, so long as the correct route widths are incorporated (relative to the shared or segregated decision), the CHA does need to know what the final decision is in order to ensure technical compliance to decision.

Applicant to provide further response to this, providing, in particular, actual widths proposed for cycle and footways under and over the railway bridge and how they comply with LTN 1/20.

Access routes should be considered at the onset and are not hard to incorporate on a drawing with suitable caveats/TBA's. Even if they are indicative only, the CHA will need to see these at the next iteration of the drawings.

RSA responses + RSA Decision Log. WSCC will need a revised RSA because of design changes. Access to Lidsey Farm north of southern tie-in needs to be considered in this too.

Noise attenuation – WSCC need to know that the locations of any noise attenuation would be such that they don't present any highway safety issues such as obstruction to visibility areas, cycling and footway/path routes etc. and could be easily accessed for maintenance purposes. Of course, noise assessment is a matter for Arun Environmental Health and they need to advise as to whether the mitigation provided is appropriate. You have confirmed that if any is required that it would be steel.

Reply required to request for cycle track width to be re-visited (widened) to provide for two-way flows on both sides of the new road.

Alignment of foot and cycle paths towards side roads at roundabouts – alignment on approaches should be sweetened, if possible, to avoid sharp turns.

Walking and cycling links (and connections thereto) - Links across and outside of site by Phillip Howard and the western-end to be provided by the developer. As it's one of the main strategic routes it needs to be constructed fully. This also applies to other routes where links enter and leave the site. Developer to liaise with PH school and PRoW team and provide evidence of same and outcomes.

Grade-separated railway crossings (E-W and N-S) including crossing of adjacent railway lines (main line and Bognor-Barnham branch line – latter in proximity of the old canal) – Applicant to set-out their strategy for grade-separate crossings.

Parking (and TRO) strategy (throughout the development and for proposed station parking) – Applicant to provide their strategy for any parking restrictions throughout the development and at, and close to, the proposed station parking area.

PT Strategy – update required.

With regard to the information provided in response to WSCC response 3 (pages 19-23 – detailed design matters to do with new A29), WSCC will review this as it was part of the information missing from one of the re-consultations. However, please note that if any parts of the road design changes, then a further submission of information for review would be required.

T.Townsend,
20/10/2022