

FROM: Ian Gledhill **TO:** Arun District Council
FAO: Richard Temple

SUBJECT: EG/6/18/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline consent
EG/71/14/OUT for the erection of 60 No. dwellings with new vehicular access, open space &
ancillary works.

**Eastergate Fruit Farm, Barnham Road, Barnham, Eastergate, West Sussex,
PO20 3RP**

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice	☒	Modification	☒	More Information	☐
Objection	☐	No Objection	☐	Refusal	☐

1. West Sussex County Council, in its role as Local Highway Authority, has previously commented on the outline planning permission EG/71/14. It is recognised that the principle and matters of access as well as the consideration of the impact on the wider highway network have been approved via the outline permission. No further comments are made on these matters at this stage. The current application seeks permission for those previously reserved matters.
2. With regards to the details submitted, it's unclear whether it is the applicant's intentions to offer the internal roads for adoption or not. Comments are made on the basis that the roads will be offered for adoption. With this in mind, the hard landscaping drawings shows the proposed surfacing materials within the carriageway, footway, and casual parking areas. Whilst the LHA acknowledge these materials, at this stage, comments are made only in respects of the planning merits of the scheme. The acceptance of materials for use within adoptable areas will be made as part of any agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980.
3. In connection with the above, if it is the intention to offer the internal roads for adoption, a plan showing be provided showing the likely extents. Confirmation should be provided also as to who will be taking over the responsibility for the car parking area to the northeast of plots 35-36.
4. The submitted plans indicate predominantly a standard segregated carriageway and footway arrangement, with a 5.5 metre carriageway and 2 metre footways. Such an arrangement accords with the guidance within Manual for Streets.
5. Plots 1-5 and 11-15 are served by way of a narrower carriageway/footway. These areas appear to be more akin to shared surfaces although a footway is also included. Whilst the principle of the reduce carriageway width is acceptable given the lightly trafficked nature of these areas, it is unlikely that these would be adopted by the LHA.
6. Throughout the development, traffic management measures (ramped pinch points and buildouts) are shown. Within new developments, it is normal practice for the design of the road to act as the restraint to vehicle speeds rather than rely on physical traffic calming features. Again, the rationale behind the inclusion of such features should be explained and these feature removed if at all possible. Changes of surfacing at junctions would be a preferred form of traffic management.

7. Although the widths are acceptable, the geometry at the following junctions is not suitable,
8. The spacing of the junction serving plots 46-60 is too close to the main site junction onto Barnham Road. The spacing as shown is unlikely to provide adequate inter-visibility between a vehicle entering the development from Barnham Road and a vehicle waiting to exit the junction within the development. The spacing should therefore be increased. Notwithstanding the following comments, subject to a revised design, it may be possible to create a crossroads with the junction serving plots 1-5. This would thereby increase junction spacing.
9. The kerb radii at the junction serving plots 1-5 with the road serving plots 6-45 is much too great. The arrangement as shown does not comply with MfS guidance (which encourages smaller kerb radii) and also results in a significant area of carriageway for pedestrians to cross, which again is bad practice. The use of over-runnable areas, especially on the desirelines for crossing pedestrians, should also be designed out. Due to the low number of dwellings served, the bellmouth serving plots 1-5 could be replaced with a crossover. This would then give priority to pedestrian movements rather than vehicular traffic and significantly reduce the area of carriageway.
10. The same comments would also apply to the junction serving plots 46-50 and plots 51-60. In this instance, it's unclear which of the two roads would have priority. Whilst the arrangement appears to be designed to enable further development at the western end of the road serving plots 46-50, the junction of these two roads should still be designed with some deflection for traffic associated with plots 51-60. The current arrangement may only otherwise encourage over-shooting of the junction. Again, the arrangement is also poor for pedestrians, who are required to cross a significant distance of carriageway to continue northwards.
11. There is quite a distance (approximately 68 metres) between the turning head and the end of the access road adjacent to plot 60. The waste collection team should be contacted to ensure that they are satisfied with the arrangements for bin collections on this length of access road. Notwithstanding refuse collection, account should be given also to other delivery vehicles and the distance that a vehicle would need to reverse to turn. It is recommended that the turning head close to plots 56 and 57 is repositioned close towards plot 60 thereby reducing the reversing distance. This could be achieved within land that falls within the control of the applicant.
12. The positioning of the two on-street visitor parking bays adjacent to the pedestrian crossing point to the play area opposite plots 32-36 would restrict visibility for those trying to cross. Whilst the development would be low speed/lightly trafficked, there are a number of other locations in close vicinity where these bays could be relocated to removing the potential for obstruction.
13. The parallel visitor parking bays to the rear of plots 28-31 would be quite difficult to access and exit due to the limited turning space within the parking court. Compared with other parts of the development, there are relatively few visitor parking bays on-street in the vicinity of these plots. There would seem scope for these two bays to be moved onto the access road alongside plot 7. The visitor bays would then be much more apparent rather than being included within a private parking court.

14. The parking areas for plots 56 and 57 are somewhat remote from the dwelling entrances. It is considered more likely that residents will park on-street or within the nearby visitor parking bay as this would be more convenient than using the parking bays to the rear. Consideration should be given to making the parking areas more attractive for use, by for example, having direct footpath connections from these to the dwelling entrances. Alternately and in conjunction with point 11, this area could be re-planned so as to remove the turning head and rearrange the parking so as to be directly onto the main access road.
15. Whilst not a safety consideration, it's unclear why plots 51 and 60 have such large driveways. These could seemingly be reduced in length without any apparent issue.
16. In summary, confirmation/further information/revised plans should be provided to address the above points.

Ian Gledhill
Planning Services