

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL  
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

**DATE: 15<sup>th</sup> May 2017**

**FROM: Tim Townsend TO: Arun District Council  
FAO: Claire Potts**

**SUBJECT: LU/121/17/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline consent LU/47/11/ for construction of 126 No. dwellings together with internal road network, car parking & landscaping.**

**LOCATION: Land North of, Toddington Lane, C1 & part Parcels B2, B4 & C2, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 7PP.**

**DATE OF SITE VISIT: N/A for purpose of this planning application.**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

|                  |                                     |                     |                                     |                         |                                     |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Advice</b>    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <b>Modification</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <b>More Information</b> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>Objection</b> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>No Objection</b> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>Refusal</b>          | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

**S106 contribution total (see below for breakdown): £(please see S106 secured at outline stage of proposal)**

---

This is the WSCC highways and transport response to the above planning application. Drainage comments will be made separately by the drainage engineer.

**The following information has been considered:**

1. Letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> March 2017 – Laura Graham (Persimmon Homes) to Claire Potts (Arun DC)
2. Design Statement produced by Persimmon Homes (March 2017)
3. Transport Statement produced by Mayer Brown Transportation Consultants (March 2017)
4. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Response Report produced by Mayer Brown Transportation Consultants (March 2017) – authored by Adrian Barnley of Mayer Brown with specific date of 20<sup>th</sup> March 2017

And drawings:

- Landscape Layout A088461 LA100.dwg – 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2017 (produced by White Young Green)
- Site Layout – HOUSE TYPE MIX - 543\_PL\_SITE LAYOUT\_104 – February 2017 (produced by Persimmon Homes)
- Surface Treatments Drawing (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/11-1 Rev. P4 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Surface Treatments Drawing (2 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/11-2 Rev. P4 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- General Arrangement Drawing (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/10-1 Rev.P4 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- General Arrangement Drawing (2 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/10-2 Rev.P4 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Bin/Cycle Store – Proposed Plans and Elevations – 543\_PL\_BCS\_100 – February 2017 (Persimmon Homes)

- Single Garage – Proposed Plans and Elevations – 543\_PL\_GARAGES\_100 – February 2017 (Persimmon Homes)
- Double Garage – Proposed Plans and Elevations – 543\_PL\_GARAGED\_100 – February 2017 (Persimmon Homes)
- Site Layout – COLOUR – 543\_PL\_SITE LAYOUT\_101 – February 2017 (Persimmon Homes)
- Site Layout – PARKING STRATEGY – 543\_PL\_SITE LAYOUT\_105 (Persimmon Homes)
- Site Layout – BIN COLLECTION – 543\_PL\_SITE LAYOUT\_108 (Persimmon Homes)
- Anticipated swept-path of a large refuse vehicle and large car accessing the site (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-1 REV. P3 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Anticipated swept-path of a large refuse vehicle and large car accessing the site (2 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-2 REV. P3 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)

### **Summary position of Highway Authority.**

Further information and modifications required.

### **Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response.**

In-line with WSCC policy requirements, please provide RSA in correct WSCC format and signed and dated, including plans reviewed and locations of problems identified and where recommendations have been carried-over to new plans. Designer's Response also to be provided signed and dated. When both are received, the content will be reviewed.

### **Landscaping (main access/spine road only).**

Comments to follow separately when available.

### **Access roads.**

*Widths* – The main 'avenue'/spine road running into the development appears to measure 6.0m wide which is suitable for large vehicles to pass one-another on straight sections. For parts of the road to be built in the future that have curves and/or bends, tracking diagrams will be required to determine suitability of any carriageway widths proposed. All other roads proposed within the application limits appear to measure 4.8m wide (other than for some short lengths providing access to plots 33-35 and 61-64 where these are shown as informal private driveway arrangements). Entrances to parking courts serving plots 95-100 (Apartment Block A) and plots 117-122 (houses) measure 4.1m wide at the actual crossing points to and from the estate roads. After that, the accesses serving these properties widen-out to 6.0m to permit manoeuvring in and out of car parking spaces.

*Refuse and fire vehicle access* – This is demonstrated by way of swept-path tracking diagrams shown on drawings A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-1 REV. P3 and A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-2 REV. P3. However, the 'track' of a refuse vehicle attempting to enter/leave the parking access drives serving plots 99-100 and 117-122 show overriding of the access points to the main carriageways and, in the case of the later plots, oversailing of the footway opposite. As such, the width of the access points should be re-assessed to determine suitability. As a possible alternative, the applicant might wish to consider bin stores located within suitable distances to the main access roads. However, the acceptability of that would have to be assessed by checking with the refuse services.

*Surface treatments (roads, footways, landscaping etc.)* – These are shown on Mayer Brown drawings A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/11-1 and A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/11-2 (although landscaping proposals are shown in more detail on White Young Green (WYG) drawing A088461 LA100.dwg). Road surface finishes are shown to be either traditional bituminous carriageways or block paving (private drives and raised table tops at some of the junctions – other than the tabletop adjacent to plots 80 and 95-100). This latter one should be reviewed because the surface treatment is not consistent with the other tables elsewhere in the layout. Also, parts of the layout appear to differ from the illustrative Masterplan Drawing No. 519-GR.L\_002 that forms part of 'sister' S73 planning

application LU/192/15/PL (one example being the length of the main spine road running alongside the proposed commercial area). Applicant to explain this. Further tactile paving needs to be provided at appropriate crossing points. Areas where this needs to be shown are at junctions adjacent to plots 27, 80, 95-100 and for the tactiles shown by plot 126, those moved closer to the junction onto the desire line for crossing and further to enable people to cross the road N-S. All tactiles should be shown on desire lines to aid crossing roads. The foot/cycleway and parking configuration outside plots 81-86 and 87-94 need to be amended as this puts drivers in a position where they will be reversing on or off the main spine road with limited visibility because of lack of footway in front. It also potentially compromises service margin provision. Furthermore, if the intention is to offer this for adoption, private car parking spaces cannot be included in the public highway. Please amend.

*Speed controls etc.* – Raised tabletops are shown at a number of the junctions within the overall layout. In addition to this, speed cushions are shown on certain straight sections of carriageway between the road tables. Traditionally, speed cushions would be used in *existing* situations where traffic speeds are shown to exceed the prescribed speed limit, whereas this is a new situation. As such, the applicant should provide evidence and consideration of alternatives for speed control for the roads where cushions are shown. These should be submitted to the LPA and CHA to consider. It should also be demonstrated how anything proposed will control traffic speeds to the speed limit proposed and how they would be suitable for the road users expected to use them.

*Visibility splays* – Need to be appropriately shown in accordance with relevant guidance at all junctions and where driveways join carriageways (including consideration of landscaping and demonstration that planting etc. does not obstruct visibility splays). Some are shown but not all. Please amend.

*Adopted or non-adopted* – This needs to be shown. Subject to suitable design and construction standards to WSCC specification and given that it is intended to serve as a bus route and provide access to a school and public community facilities, consideration could be given to having the main spine road adopted. Applicant to confirm intentions and what materials (including drainage) are proposed.

### **Parking.**

*Cars* - Is shown either on-curtilage (as spaces or as a combination of spaces and garages), in front of properties (in a row) or in parking courts. Internal garage dimensions appear to comply with guidance given in Manual for Streets (MfS) – basically 3m x 6m. This will permit most vehicles to be able to use them and provide storage for other items at the rear. All other parking spaces appear to measure the standard 2.4m x 4.8m, other than where they are located alongside fences/walls where they measure slightly wider at 3.0m – this latter dimension allowing for easier entry and exit to and from vehicles. Only exceptions to this are plots 28 and 65 – both should have their driveways widened to 3.0m. Parking for plot 17 seems excessively large/long – please amend. Likewise, garages for plots 22, 23, 30, 31, 39, 40, 53, 54, 101, 102, 103 and 104 all appear to be set well-back into the plots providing over-long driveways. Again, please amend.

*Cycles* – Are shown parked in sheds, garages or communal parking facilities for all properties. Recommend that in addition to private cycle parking, that visitor provision be provided across the development.

*Motorcycles* – None shown. This should be shown, please.

### **Visitor parking.**

This is only shown in limited locations and numbers. As such, more should be shown throughout the layout to reduce the likelihood of on-street car parking - preference being for lay-by arrangements alongside carriageways. Also, given the commercial nature of the first part of the main spine road, further consideration should be given to visitor parking in this location as well.

The needs of mobility impaired users should also be considered. The applicant should also be prepared – post-construction – to fund a possible Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to restrict parking on the spine road adjacent to the commercial areas. Applicant to confirm.

**Access on-foot and by bike.**

Footways are shown throughout the entire layout, other than on private drives. However, the footway alongside plots 17 and 29-32 (currently shown measuring 1.0-1.2m) should be widened to a minimum of 1.8m. A shared footway/cycleway is shown on the south side of the main spine road and runs E-W through the layout and connecting (at the western end) to the approved IDR access road. For continuity of shared foot/cycle links (and to minimise crossing of roads by cyclists in particular), consideration should be given to a shared foot/cycle use on north side of spine road. It is also recommended that all private access paths leading directly to properties should be demonstrated DDA compliant. Please show. Also, are walking and cycling connections to be included from the REM site to the commercial element adjacent to it (particularly the development north of the commercial area)?

**Street lighting.**

To be provided for the layout. SSE Contracting would be pleased to provide information at the cost of the developer.

**Bus stops.**

Other than a 'cage' marking being shown on the main access spine road leading into the development (eastbound only), no further detail has been shown for bus infrastructure. Applicant to provide evidence of discussions with bus companies and other interested parties (WSCC and Town Council) – including risk assessments - to establish requirements.

Please re-consult.

Thank you.

**Tim Townsend**  
**Strategic Planning**