

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:Amber Willard
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	24 November 2019
LOCATION:	20 Flansham Lane Bognor Regis PO22 6AB
SUBJECT:	FP/205/19/HH Drop kerb extension to front of property.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Modification
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

This application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Scheme protocol for small scale proposals which include up to 5 residential units or extensions to single units accessed from roads that do not form part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). As such the comments provided by Local Development should be considered to be advice only, with respect to this planning application.

This proposal has been considered by means of a desktop study, using the information and plans submitted with this application, in conjunction with other available WSCC map information. A site visit can be arranged on request.

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

This proposal is for drop kerb extension to front of property. It is located and accessed via Flansham Lane which is a B-classified road subject to 30mph speed limit.

Access

The proposed extension to the dropped kerb measures 3.7m resulting in a total dropped kerb width of 9.3m to serve the existing dwelling and the associated building.

Any vehicle access works on the public highway must be implemented under licence to a specification obtained from WSCC Highways.

Typically the maximum width of a dropped crossing to serve a single dwelling is 6.4 metres. The applicant should be aware that any such licence application may be rejected regardless of planning consent.

I have approached the Area Manager who has provided the following comments:

'My preference here would be to move the existing access (which doesn't appear to line up with the property frontage) and to permit a maximum 6.4m in a more central location. I'm not massively concerned with on-street parking capacity as it stands, but we need to be conscious of future supply/demand in the area.'

Based on the plans and details before me I would be minded to advise that any vehicle crossover extension should be modified to result in a crossover no greater than 6.4 metres in width and relocated to be in line with the site entrance, as per the advice given above. I'm minded to advise such a modification could be secured via planning condition, however given recent advice within the National Planning Policy Framework it is advised such matters are resolved prior to determination. As such this issue should be raised with the applicant and the Local Highways Authority re-consulted.

Visibility splays at the access point appear sufficient for the posted speed limits, and data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police, over a period of the past five years reveals no recorded injury accidents in the vicinity of the site, caused by the road layout. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the existing access is operating unsafely or that the proposal would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

There are no proposed alterations to the existing parking arrangements.

Conclusion

In principle the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 109), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal. However, matters relating to the access width should be agreed prior to determination to mitigate against the applicant gaining planning permission for something they may subsequently not be able to implement.

Please raise this with the applicant, at which time appropriate conditions and informative notes can be advised.

Anastasia Toleva
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services