

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Amy Myer
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority: Tim Townsend
DATE:	12th March 2020
LOCATION:	Land Adjacent to Highfield House Yapton Road Barnham PO22 0AZ
SUBJECT:	BN/128/19/OUT Application for Outline Planning Permission for development of 70 bed Care Home and 14 Assisted Living Bungalows with associated car parking, landscaping and access - Departure from the Development Plan. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response provided.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	3 rd March 2020
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	Non-highways to be provided separately. Highways TBA.

This is the second WSCC County Highway Authority (CHA) response to the above planning application for outline Planning Permission for development of a 70 bed Care Home and 14 Assisted Living Bungalows with associated car parking, landscaping and access - Departure from the Development Plan.

Site location and proposed access.

The site (and access to it) is located to the north of the B2233 Yapton Road, Barnham – approximately mid-way between the villages of Barnham and Yapton. At this location, the road is subject to a 30mph speed limit. The access leads to a car park for the care home and with a separate parking area for the assisted living units.

Internal layout.

While the internal access arrangements would not be eligible for adoption, it is observed that the footway shown entering the site narrows where it meets the first 'bank' of parking spaces adjacent to part of the care home. As part of any detailed design, it is recommended that a minimum width of 1.5m is provided for any continuation of a path into the care home if it is intended to run behind the parking spaces. If the intention is to provide a shared-arrangement for users using the access 'road', then adequate markings, pram ramps, tactile paving should be provided.

Non-motorised access to the assisted living units would rely on residents sharing the vehicular access. While shared-space arrangements are common, provision should be made to ensure that residents will have a suitable place to cross the internal access 'road' to reach the units (i.e. pram ramps, tactile paving and visibility splays). Furthermore, 1.0m-wide strips should be provided behind and to the side of the parking spaces for these units to give a place to board and alight without having to stand on

grassed or other soft-landscaped areas. The 1.5m wide paths should also be provided here.

Traffic generation.

Section 5 of the Transport Statement (TS) sets-out travel demand for the proposal. Both peak-period 'total people trips' and solely vehicle-based trips are set-out in Tables 5.3 and 5.5 of the TS respectively.

For the 'total combined trips' (so all trips by all modes etc.), the impact would be as follows:

AM (08:00-09:00): Arrivals - 12; Departures - 8 (Total - 20)

PM (17:00-18:00): Arrivals - 7; Departures - 10 (Total - 17)

For the vehicle-based trips, the impact would be as follows:

AM (08:00-09:00): Combined arrivals and departures - 15

PM (17:00-18:00): Combined arrivals and departures - 13

Road Safety.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response accompanies the proposal. The audit has raised five concerns and provided recommendations alongside these. The problems are generally as follows with recommendations alongside (full details can be found in the Road Safety Audit undertaken by RKS Associates dated 27th February 2020):

1. Problem - Location of road gullies in relation to the proposed access and traffic movements across them. Recommendation - Ensure that the locations are outside of the vehicle paths using the site.
2. Problem - Skid resistance of gully covers in relation to the position of the access for road users. Recommendation - Ensure that the locations of the gullies are outside of the paths of vehicles or that the covers have appropriate skid resistant properties.
3. Problem - Possible vehicular conflicts in the access (large vehicles coming-across smaller ones). Recommendation - That the access be widened to accommodate all movements to avoid conflicts.
4. Problem - Site access visibility splays and associated maintenance. Recommendation - That the correct splays are provided and maintained with appropriate maintenance provision etc.
5. Problem - Possible obstruction to pedestrians caused by an existing telegraph pole. Recommendation - That the pole be moved to prevent obstruction to pedestrians.

The designer of the scheme has agreed with the recommendations made. However, the CHA does require the applicant to consider point 4 above further (see comments below). Following that, the Road Safety Audit 'log' sheet (a requirement of the latest Road Safety Audit Standards) might need to be updated, including other additions the CHA has added to the log table already. If further changes are made and/or required by either the designer and/or CHA, these will also need to be discussed and reflected in the log. When all Road Safety Audit matters are agreed between parties, a copy of the log must be retained by both the CHA and LPA on their respective files and be signed and dated by the designer and CHA (the Design Organisation and Overseeing Organisation respectively).

A DRAFT copy is provided below which should be updated by the applicant's Designer in the appropriate places. In particular, the full RSA 'problem' and full 'recommendation' should be put in the relevant boxes by the designer:

RSA Problem	RSA recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
2.1 Potential collisions due to standing water or service covers	When preparing the detailed design, ensure adequate surface water drainage and locate gullies/service covers clear of desire lines, cyclists and powered two-wheel vehicles.	Noted. This recommendation will be addressed at detailed design as part of the surface water drainage scheme, as suggested.	Agree with Design Organisation.	<u>Design Organisation:</u> Overseeing Organisation: That the recommendation be addressed at the detailed design stage.
2.2 Potential risk of loss control collisions due to differential skid resistance of service covers and carriageway	When preparing the detailed design, ensure that the existing service covers are either relocated away from the desire lines for cyclists and powered two-wheel vehicles or exhibit similar skid resistance properties as the adjacent carriageway.	Noted. This recommendation will be addressed at detailed design as suggested. It is expected that any service cover will have similar skid resistance properties as the adjacent carriageway.	Agree with Design Organisation.	<u>Design Organisation:</u> Overseeing Organisation: That the recommendation be addressed at the detailed design stage.
3.1 Potential collisions associated with insufficient road space	Review the layout, it may be more appropriate to widen the access to ensure vehicles can pass each other safely.	The indicative layout is subject to detailed design considerations. Nevertheless, the indicative internal access has been designed to provide additional carriageway width immediately before the access onto Yapton Road. This would provide additional space for a vehicle to wait while a large vehicle such as a refuse vehicle completes its manoeuvre into the site. Furthermore, the majority of predicted vehicle movements for the proposed development are	Agree with Design Organisation. Although the access does still demonstrate some conflict between large and small vehicles when entering and/or leaving the site, the movement of large vehicles such as refuse lorries would be infrequent and given the low to moderate traffic generating capabilities of the site overall, opportunities for conflicting traffic movements would present very rarely and would not be unusual to other examples elsewhere, with	<u>Design Organisation:</u> Overseeing Organisation: That the access remains as generally shown on drawing no. J32-4375-001 for the reasons given in the Overseeing Organisation's response in the preceding section.

		likely to relate to smaller vehicle types rather than a large vehicle. The width of the proposed access (5.5m with 6m radii as standard) and internal access (approx. 6m) can comfortably accommodate two vehicles passing each other.	<i>associated low risk to users. Two cars coming-across one-another (i.e. what the majority of users would be travelling in on a daily basis) would not appear to conflict with one-another.</i>	
3.2 Vehicular collisions associated with poor visibility	Ensure that the existing vegetation adjacent to the visibility splay cut back and regularly maintained or replaced with a low level variety in order to provide good visibility for motorists exiting onto Yapton Road.	The proposed access provides visibility splays of 2.4m by 54m to the east and 51m to the west. These splays are based on recorded 85th percentile speeds, adjusted for wet weather and MfS sight stopping distance calculations. The splays provide sufficient visibility as per the WSCC guidance for the application of MfS calculations on a 30mph road as detailed in their Local Design Guide Supplementary Guidance. Vegetation within the visibility splay will be managed and kept to a maximum height of 600mm.	Agree with Design Organisation. <i>The response to the vegetation maintenance issue is accepted by the Overseeing Organisation. However, further info required from the designer in response to the visibility point raised in the RSA recommendation.</i>	<u>Design Organisation:</u> <u>Overseeing Organisation:</u> <i>That the vegetation is regularly managed and kept to a minimum of 600mm in order to maintain the required sight line splays.</i>
4.1 Potential for injury to pedestrians	Ensure that the telegraph pole is relocated to the back of footway where it does not cause an obstruction for pedestrians.	Noted. At detailed design the existing telegraph pole will be relocated to the back of footway so as not to obstruct the movement of pedestrians.	Agree in-part with the Design Organisation. <i>However, the CHA recommends that the telegraph pole is located in a suitable place where it does not cause an obstruction for pedestrians and other non-motorised users such as those who</i>	<u>Design Organisation:</u> <u>Overseeing Organisation:</u>

			<i>are mobility-impaired or have pushchairs etc.</i>	
--	--	--	--	--

Specifically with regard to point 4 (site access visibility splays), it is not apparent that the Transport Consultant has used the latest standards for determining the necessary visibility splays. CA185 is the correct document and evidence should be provided that (1), it has been used and (2), how the splays shown comply with the Design Standard.

Parking.

Car parking – Current advice is contained in the Arun District Council SPD. However, it does not provide numbers for parking for the specific uses proposed in this planning application. The illustrative layout shows the following:

Care home – 26 spaces in total (inclusive of 2 blue-badge and 8 electric vehicle spaces)
Assisted living units – 18 spaces in total (inclusive of 2 blue-badge and 5 electric vehicle spaces).

Total number of parking spaces - 44

As guidance is now based on expected demand, the applicants set-out their case for the number now shown. The Arun DC parking guidance states that key to any consideration of parking numbers is what any residual impact parking might be on the local road network - to both avoid overspill and, importantly, road safety implications, whilst maintaining a balance to promote sustainable access modes. The CHA's key consideration is road safety.

As submitted, the CHA considers the applicant hasn't provided enough evidence to support the numbers shown. As such, more information with examples of similar sites should be provided. Furthermore, although 5% disabled blue badge parking is shown for the scheme, Manual for Streets (MfS) does suggest that where elderly people are likely to be prevalent, more is likely to be required. This should also be considered further.

With regard to the layout of the parking (and access) area, this appears to generally comply in terms of space sizing and circulatory provision for refuse and other large vehicles. However, at any detailed design stage, the applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with Building Regulations with regard to fire appliance access – particularly to the buildings in the north-eastern corner of the site and those located in the far-western part of the site. Both appear to exceed the 45m requirement.

Finally on the design of the car parking and again at the detailed design stage, the circulatory area shown for the assisted living units should be extended by 1m westwards to assist with on-site turning and manoeuvring.

Cycle parking – This appears to be acceptable in-principle although some additional spaces should be provided for the assisted care units.

Mobility scooter parking – This does need to be provided generously throughout the development and in a useable, secure, covered and convenient building (or buildings) with charging points for all scooter places provided – not just some of them as suggested in paragraph 4.3.3 of the TS (page 15). Further work is required to demonstrate that provision would be adequate for users (both in terms of numbers and actual facilities).

Sustainable access.

Walking - The proposal includes a widened footway (2m) running along the entirety of the site frontage to Yapton Road. The current footway measures approximately 1.2-1.5m wide. In addition, the applicant suggests that a contribution could be made available to the CHA to provide improvements to other parts of the nearby footway network.

Specifically looking westwards towards Barnham where a greater number of shops, conveniences and the railway station exists (compared to Yapton), the footway along the northern-side of the Yapton Road is continuous, only requiring pedestrians to cross to the south-side close to the Murrell Arms public house to ensure continuity of route, then by using the footway on the south-side of the road and further-on to the railway and shops. The footway does vary in width between 0.9m to 1.8m wide. The sections closest to the site generally measure between 0.9 (outside the cottages found east of the entrance to Sunnyside Nurseries and west of this point - the later for approximately 70-80m) to 1.2m elsewhere – only really widening when they get closer to the former Angels Nursery and Murrell's Field also found west. It is recognised that the footway on the north-side does continue eastwards to Yapton and again at varying widths but because of the transport links and services found in Barnham, it is considered that westwards is the route most-likely to be used by non-motorised users wishing to access the development proposals.

As such and to maximise potential for trips by those not able or wishing to travel by car, the applicant should consider where improvements to footway widths can be made and provide this to the LPA and CHA to consider. The CHA would expect any improvements to be provided by the applicant and secured by S106 Agreement. Any works would need to be accompanied by an additional Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response (Road Safety Audit 'log') and be agreed prior to the planning application being determined by the LPA.

Finally on this point, a 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian intervisibility splay should be provided at the south-eastern corner of the site adjacent to the Public Right of Way (PRoW) for visibility purposes for users.

Cycling – As set-out in the TS, users are currently reliant on using Yapton Road should they wish to cycle.

Bus – Service 66a and 66C operate a fairly infrequent service along Yapton Road (approximately 1 bus every 1.5 – 2 hours). Stops are, however, located relatively close-by.

Rail – Barnham Railway station is located to the west of the site – approximately 1.5kms – providing regular services along the south coast and to London.

Taxi – A well-used taxi rank is located outside the railway station.

Travel Plan.

A Framework Travel Plan is provided alongside the application. In addition to the measures already set-out in it, the following should be included in any final plan:

- Trip rate reduction target (for vehicle-based trips);
- Provision of storage and changing facilities, showers etc. for cyclists (not 'consideration of' as currently stated); and,
- Provision of interest-free season ticket loans for staff wishing to use public transport.

Conclusion.

Based on that submitted so far, the CHA considers that the following additional information and/or modifications is/are required:

1. The attached Road Safety Audit 'log' to be updated by the designer ('Design Organisation') in accordance with the comments made above.
2. Provision of further information relating to visibility requirements and demonstration by the applicants/the designer that the sight line splays are compliant with DMRB standards contained in CA185.
3. Further examples and justification about the parking numbers to be provided.
4. Provision of cycle parking for the assisted living units.
5. Further information about provision for mobility scooter parking provision and associated facilities.
6. Plans showing consideration of off-site footway improvements for the section running westwards towards Barnham (including additional Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Road Safety Audit log).
7. Provision of amended plan showing 2.4m x 2.4m pedestrian intervisibility splay at the south-eastern corner of the site adjacent to the Public Right of Way (PRoW).

When further information is available, the CHA will consider the proposal further.

Thank you,

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services