

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	<u>Arun</u> District Council <u>FAO:</u> Michael Eastham
FROM:	<u>WSSC</u> - Highway Authority: Tim Townsend
DATE:	13 August 2020
LOCATION:	Land at Angels Nursery <u>Yapton</u> Road <u>Barnham</u> <u>PO22 0AY</u>
SUBJECT:	<u>BN/84/20/PL</u> Application for variation of condition 2 (<u>approved</u> plans) imposed on planning permission BN/93/19/PL for the development of 95 dwellings; and consequential changes to other conditions following commencement of development.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	<u>n/a</u> for purposes of this application (site visited previously)
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required and Modification
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	SEE S106 FOR OUTLINE PROPOSAL

This is the WSSC Highway Authority (CHA) response to the above planning application for variation of condition 2 (approved plans) imposed on planning permission BN/93/19/PL for the development of 95 dwellings; and consequential changes to other conditions following commencement of development.

Comments below specifically respond to site layout details shown on 'Site Layout' drawing P19-0723-10 Revision 'N' dated 16th July 2020 produced by Pegasus Design. Should the case officer consider that there are further matters in this proposal needing consideration by the CHA, he should notify the author of this report at the earliest time.

Highway position.

The following amendments to the proposed layout and additional information is required in order that the CHA can consider the proposal further:

1. Tie-in points where the internal main spine road becomes 'block paved streets' (assumed to be shared surface street sans footway - applicant to confirm this) need to be shown more clearly with rumble strips and appropriate footway tie-ins. The key locations are those adjacent to plots 13 and 56.
2. The width of the service margins adjacent to plots 37-39 and 75-78 and then up to the two visitor spaces shown opposite plot 61 are not adequate to enable adoption of these sections of road. WSSC requirements would be for uniform 2.0m wide service margins unless no development ran alongside or fronted those sections. The consequence of not providing adequate service margins in these locations potentially means that the entire layout cannot be adopted. This is because the first sections of spine road leading to the block paved sections of roads would end-up as 'dead ends' with no turning facilities with resultant insufficient public utility. Applicant should also state intention for adoption or whether the intention is for the development's roads to remain private. If the former, a plan showing which ones should be provided.

3. Rumble strips should be shown at all transition points between different road types (including private drives).
4. Applicant to confirm that no parts of the internal road and private drive network are less than 4.8m wide. However, it is recommended that the spine road be 5.5m wide.
5. Further detail of the layout and dimensions of the private drive running E-W to the south of the site should be provided as the current planning drawings are unclear. Details such as kerb edges, carriageway edges, materials and widths etc. should be shown.
6. Confirmation that contrasting materials will be used for all different road surfaces should also be provided.
7. It is recommended that some form of speed control is provided mid-way along the E-W private drive located to the south of the site. Sufficient spaces should be given to ensure that refuse and fire appliance vehicles would be able to traverse it/go through it.
8. While parking numbers is now a matter to be considered by the LPA, it should be noted that there appears to be poor distribution of visitor parking in certain locations – namely outside plots 6, 14-23, 38 39 and 72-76. And, where visitor spaces are shown parallel to the carriageway of any roads, there should be a 1.0m-wide section of hardstanding behind them if footways aren't already provided.
9. A tracking diagram for refuse and fire appliances should be provided for the entire layout demonstrating all necessary access for such vehicles to all properties in-line with standard requirements.
10. Further detail of the 'cut-off' feature in the central private drive to be provided.
11. The tie-in of the shared footway/cycleway opposite plot 52 should be shown.
12. Clear plans should be provided showing the details of the foot and cycle connections to land south of Barnham Community Hall (to the west) and also to Lillies Nurseries (to the east). With regard to the western link, a path is shown extended into the field but no connection point shown. The red boundary edging is also not shown around this link where it extends west of the planning application site. To enable the link to be provided, the red edging should be extended and notice served on the neighbouring site (owners or custodians thereof) in order to secure it.
13. Pedestrian access is poorly shown to plots 40-43, 44-46 and 85-88. Please shown minimum 1.2m wide paths to access these properties from adjacent roadways/private drives.
14. In previous versions of the layout, a shared foot and cycle link was shown in the approximate position of the private drive running between plots 84 and 85 leading to Barnham Community Hall. Applicant to explain why this has now been removed (and to see whether it can be reinstated).

Please re-consult when the above information is available, at which time the CHA will consider the proposal further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services