

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Tim Townsend [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 September 2015 10:59  
**To:** caroline.gould  
**Cc:** Neil Crowther; Harvey Rogers; Paul Davis; Adrian Barnley; Barry Smith  
**Subject:** RE: LU/114/15/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline planning consent LU/47/11 for layout, appearance and landscaping of access road.

Dear Caroline,

Thank you for your email of 9<sup>th</sup> September 2015.

My comments are as follows:

1. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Addendum Brief – The Brief is largely fine as written. Just a few points: I will require the removal of my name on page 1 as it's not WSCC policy to include such details on such documents. Also, the northern (new) roundabout is not proposed to be signalised. Please amend the description in the Brief (currently in para. 3.2, page 7 of the Brief). Also, it needs to be extremely clear that the Addendum is being carried out because of the changes to the northern end of the relief road – i.e. it changing from signals to a roundabout for traffic capacity reasons. Finally, please provide a clear plan with extent of Audit area edged in red – I'll need to see this plan before the Audit is undertaken.
2. Bellmouth radius, west side of junction with Toddington Lane – Although the swept-path diagrams don't show every vehicle passing scenario, they do show that some HGVs will require a larger radius on the western side to avoid some conflicts. Notwithstanding any previous RSA review, if I am not to raise an objection on this occasion, I would expect the option to revisit the junction at a later date to be

tied-into the forthcoming DOV. For example, if the use of Toddington Lane by HGVs (construction vehicles or otherwise) reduces when the relief road is constructed and open to traffic and/or any other issues/circumstances/changes take place affecting its operation etc. arise after its construction, that should be the time to look at it again. I would expect this - and any modification identified - to be undertaken at your client's expense. Actual wording can be discussed as and when the DOV is progressed.

3. Visibility splay, southern end of proposed road junction with Toddington Lane – I do still need to see this, please. It is fundamental to the scheme. You must demonstrate that the sightline splay crosses land in your control (or is over highways land).
4. Cycle/ped intervisibility – 'Cycling England' gives guidance about visibility splays based on stopping sight distances. Section 'B.04 Junction and Forward Visibility' should assist your designers. The 2m x 2m shown on your current version plan is often used for driveways emerging to footways. It is not suitable for the cycle-pedestrian scenario presented here. You will need to interpret the data and demonstrate why any figure chosen is appropriate. Please would you show dimensions at each junction on an amended drawing.
5. Raised tables – I have looked again at Drawing No. CV8140927/SK10 and can confirm that the table heights meet WSCC guidance at 75mm.

I trust these comments are helpful. I look forward to hearing from you further.

Regards,

Tim

Tim Townsend | Senior Planner, Planning Applications - Strategic Development, West Sussex County Council

Location: Ground floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH

---

**From:** caroline.gould [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 09 September 2015 17:57

**To:** Tim Townsend

**Cc:** [neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk](mailto:neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk); Harvey Rogers; Paul Davis; Adrian Barnley

**Subject:** RE: LU/114/15/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline planning consent LU/47/11 for layout, appearance and landscaping of access road.

**Importance:** High

Dear Tim

Further to your emails below, please find attached our written response to the points you have raised together with associated attachments. I believe it will just be Points 1 and 2 of your email that are outstanding, and that you are reviewing the Phase 1 Stage 1 RSA Addendum Brief that Paul Davis at Mayer Brown has submitted to you so that these points can progress too. We will wait to hear from you further.

Kind regards

Caroline

**Caroline Gould**  
Principal Planner

WYG

The Pavilion, 1st Floor, Botleigh Grange Office Campus, Hedge End, Southampton, Hampshire, SO30 2AF

Tel: +44 2382 022800

Fax: +44 2382 022889

Mob: +44 7884 266 505

[www.wyg.com](http://www.wyg.com)

WYG Environment Planning Transport Limited. Registered in England number: 3050297. Registered Office: Arndale Court, Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS6 2UJ VAT No: 431-0326-08



---

**From:** Tim Townsend [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 08 September 2015 10:12  
**To:** caroline.gould  
**Cc:** [neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk](mailto:neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk); Harvey Rogers  
**Subject:** FW: LU/114/15/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline planning consent LU/47/11 for layout, appearance and landscaping of access road.

Dear Caroline,

Checking through my files I can't seem to find a response from you to the email found below.

FYI, I am reviewing the Supplementary Stage 1 Road Safety Audit which, depending on the content, will hopefully respond to points 1 and 2 below.

Re. point 5, Harvey Rogers has Drawing No. A/PH-little.2/S38/278-2 Revision 'A' which now shows that required.

Therefore as I see it, it's just points 3, 4 and 9 still needing responses.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible, please.

Many thanks,

Tim

Tim Townsend | Senior Planner, Planning Applications - Strategic Development, West Sussex County Council

Location: Ground floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH

---

**From:** Tim Townsend

**Sent:** 28 July 2015 12:06

**To:** caroline.gould

**Cc:** [neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk](mailto:neil.crowther@arun.gov.uk); Harvey Rogers

**Subject:** LU/114/15/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline planning consent LU/47/11 for layout, appearance and landscaping of access road.

Dear Caroline,

Thank you for your recent emails and plans. This email specifically replies to your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> June 2015 sent to Neil Crowther and the drawings referred to in it. I have also cross-referenced it with my highways response dated 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015.

(My comments in response to the text of your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> June 2015 and associated plans are shown in red text alongside the text of my highways response dated 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015):

1. In accordance with WSCC policy, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (and Designer's Response) is required for all sections of access roads proposed to be used for bus routes and where they provide access to schools and community facilities. As the road now incorporates a right hand turning lane (shown at the northern end of the access road), this (alongside the full extent of road edged in red forming part of the application) should also be considered in its entirety (to include that further north and outside of the red edging) in the Safety Audit. Please provide. Point noted about bus route not running along estate road to north of Parcel B3. The WSCC comments about the extended right hand turning lane did not ask for its removal, they simply asked for a new Road Safety Audit because of the changes shown. You will be aware that I wrote separately to Mayer Brown inviting them to consider re-visiting the junction arrangement north of the access/spine road forming part of this RES application. However, your reply has simply been to say that your client is reverting to the as-approved arrangement. While I appreciate that the outline approval did go through a Stage 1 RSA and Departures process, we are, of course, now dealing with further detailed submissions. In light of the DRAFT Masterplan submission document (yet to be approved), perhaps now is the time to look again at some of the road infrastructure to see if changes might benefit the scheme.
2. A formal Design Check of the entire right hand turning facility should be provided. See comments above for 1.
3. Bellmouth radius, west side of junction with Toddington Lane – Bellmouth radius is shown at 20m. This has the potential to lead to high entry speeds for vehicles travelling from Toddington Lane turning left (north) into new road. Applicant to explain why this is shown as it is. If designed to be temporary (for construction purposes?) then applicant to state when bellmouth will be made smaller when no longer required (including likely timing). If acceptable to the Highway Authority, provision for future amendments/alterations – and what those are – to be tied-into S38/S278 Agreement. I have looked at the swept-path diagrams but I would ask that you look again to see if you can reduce the radius on the western side to try to reduce vehicle entry speeds without compromising vehicle movements. I am waiting to discuss the matter further with my Implementation (S38/278) Engineer. Send me another plan, please, showing a tighter radius and when I've discussed that with him I'll respond further. Please note that he is currently away on leave but I am due to speak to him next week.
4. Please provide the full extent of visibility splays at all junctions (including forward visibility splays – commensurate to pedestrians and, where they will be present, cyclists). A 4.5m 'x' distance should be shown at the junction of the north-south road with Toddington Lane. Noted. However, please provide a plan showing the full extent of the sight line splay in the trailing traffic direction (looking east) at the southern end of the access spine road with Toddington Lane. Also, the height of the road tables

needs to be increased to 75mm (0.075m) in order to meet County standard details. Please provide a new plan (or plans). Finally, the ped/cycle intervisibility splays look to be too short. Please provide information in support of the splays shown.

5. The footway on the eastern side of the main north-south access road (southern end) should be extended eastwards and tactile paving provided to correspond with a crossing point on the south side of Toddington Lane. Pedestrian visibility should also be shown at this point. This has not been shown.
6. Block paved cycle routes are not acceptable to Highway Authority for reasons of construction, maintenance and ease of use. These areas to be (machine) laid in flexible material (and confirmed as such by applicant). Noted.
7. Treatment of 'buffer zone' (between road and cycle path) to be considered further at S38 stage. Again, for reasons of construction, maintenance and ease of use, blockwork may not be suitable. Noted.
8. Tactile paving (corduroy or similar) to define start and finish of shared footways/cycleways will be considered in detail at S38 stage. Noted. The final detail and location will be checked at the detailed design (S38) stage.
9. For 'crossroad' arrangements on east-west access road, these should be constructed as raised tables in accordance with WSCC standard details. As shown, the rumble strip details are unlikely to provide adequate speed control. Please show. Recommend height should be 75mm (or 0.075m). Please show on an amended plan.

I trust my comments are helpful. Should you wish to discuss, please contact me directly (copying in Neil Crowther as well to any further correspondence).

Regards,

Tim

Tim Townsend | Senior Planner, Planning Applications - Strategic Development, West Sussex County Council

Location: Ground floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester, PO19 1RH

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.

-----  
This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the recipient. If you are not the recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version.  
-----

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.