

Littlehampton – LU/212/17/RES

Response to consultee comments in blue:

West Sussex Landscape	
Require the following information and modifications:	
(1) South of the Main Avenue should have a continuous verge (better for tree establishment / long term survival than individual planting locations). Buildings need to be set back from the footway edge to give good separation between the building elevation from trees. Continuous verge also removes the need for granite sett edging and tree grills which will require maintenance and may become distorted. (2) For any remaining tree pits section / plan drawings are required. Stakes / ties are also indicated instead of ground anchors which is unusual. (3) Services to be located in footway / carriageway not verges. (4) Error on the outline specification on LA101: subsoil British Standard is BS8601:2013. (5) Reconsider use of hornbeam, with other suitable species. (6) Car park – a continuous grass verge would be better for the birches. Use of bollards, knee rails or other barrier to prevent cars damaging tree stems should be considered,	(1) The majority of south of the Main Avenue abuts the retail element that will be delivered as part of a separate RMA. It is considered that a continuous verge would not be appropriate as this area will form part of the public realm that will be developed as part of the retail RMA. As detailed in the Development Framework Document (DFD) that accompanies the s73 application, it is envisaged that a pedestrian friendly environment will be created this area. There will be considerable pedestrian movement, both alongside the Main Avenue and crossing it, meaning that a green verge is likely to be subject to heavy footfall and thus will be compromised. As detailed in the DFD it is considered that structural tree planting is more appropriate to the creation of a pedestrian civic public realm. It is noted that the built form of the residential application will need to provide for a good separation distance from the footway edge to ensure legibility and avoid movement conflicts. (2) For any remaining tree pits shown section / plan drawings will be provided and ground anchors to be used. (3) Noted changes made to layout. (4) Landscape specification will be amended. (5) Noted, amendments to landscape strategy will be made. (6) Noted, amended to landscape strategy will be made. NOTE – the above landscaping comments will be reviewed and accommodated on revised landscape plans, which will be produced once an amended layout is agreed.
ADC Tree Consultant	
No objection	
ADC GreenSpaces	
(1) Also require a review of tree species choice and form in accordance with West Sussex Landscape. Frans Fontain would be a welcome species choice in this area. (2) Planting pit formation cross section and specification required. (3) Confirmation of who will be responsible for maintenance.	(1) Noted. (2) Noted. (3) The management company that has been established for the site. (4) Noted– suggest fenced. Landscape drawings to be amended accordingly. NOTE – the above landscaping comments will be reviewed and accommodated on revised landscape

(4) Clarification if LEAP is to be fenced / gated area or play	plans, which will be produced once an amended layout is agreed.
West Sussex Highways	
Require the following information and modifications:	
(1) An RSA and Designers Response	(1) To be provided once layout amendments agreed in principle.
(2) Tracking diagrams of Main Avenue (bends and / or curves) required	(2) To be provided once layout amendments agreed in principle.
(3) Tracking of refuse and fire vehicles to Plots 95-100 and 117-122 shows overriding of access points to the main carriageway and over-sailing of the footway opposite. Or else consider bin stores located within suitable distance to the main access roads.	(3) We have removed the refuse turning in these areas and introduced bin collection areas instead.
(4) The raised table adjacent to plot 95-100 should be reviewed as the surface treatment is not consistent with the other tables elsewhere.	(4) Tarmac is required as the raised table forms part of the Main Avenue. As such it will be subject to a consistent flow of traffic. In addition the Main Avenue is to become a bus route and block paving is not appropriate for such use (the blocks will become dislodged due to the frequency of and weight of vehicles and as such present long term management issues). Tarmac is harder wearing and lower maintenance. The raised table also falls within the section of highway that is to be proposed for adoption and tarmac is a more appropriate material for this.
(5) Layout differences with s73 Master Plan need explaining	(5) The layout has been reviewed to accommodate all comments raised. The parameter plans submitted with the s73 application form the base of the detailed development proposed through this RMA therefore we are not aware that there are any significant conflicts.
(6) Further tactile paving to be provided at appropriate crossing points – e.g. adjacent to Plots 27, 80, 95-100.	(6) Additional tactile paving has been provided where appropriate.
(7) Tactile paving by plot 126 needs to be moved closer to the junction onto the desire line for crossing to enable N-S crossing.	(7) Amendment to tactile paving made.
(8) The foot/cycleway and parking configuration outside Plots 81-86 and 87-94 need to be amended (limited reversing visibility due to lack of footway in front). Service margin in this area also compromised. Also private car spaces can not be included in the public highway.	(8) This parking arrangement was introduced to maintain tree planting. This stretch of the Main Avenue is not to be adopted. Visibility has been reviewed and tweaked where necessary. Parking bays have been increased by 500mm to provide a service margin.
(9) Evidence and consideration of alternatives for speed control where speed cushions are shown. It should also be demonstrated how any proposed will control traffic speeds to the speed limit proposed and how they would be suitable for road users expected to use them.	(9) The Stage 1 RSA raised a concern for passengers getting up to get off the bus just as it goes over a raised table. As such speed cushions were considered more appropriate. A RSA Response Report was provided with the application submission which provides this detail.
(10) Visibility Splays – need to be appropriately shown in accordance with relevant guidance at all junctions and where driveway join carriageways (including consideration of landscaping and demonstration that planting does not obstruct).	(10) Relevant amendments have been made – forward visibility around a bend have been added. Junction, pedestrian, cycle and crossing visibility are all ready shown.
(11) Adopted or non-adopted road needs to be shown.	(11) Drawing showing extent of proposed adoption now provided.
(12) Plots 28 and 65 driveways to be	(12) Plot 28 has been provided with an additional 300mm to the building side and is unobstructed on the other side. Plot 65 has 3m wide parking spaces.
	(13) Overlong drives have been revised and reduced

widened to 3m. (13) Parking for Plot 17 seems excessively long. (14) Garages for plots 22, 23, 30, 31, 39, 40, 53, 54, 101, 102, 103 and 104 are too far set back and therefore have over-long driveways. (15) Visitor cycle parking to be shown across the development (16) Motorcycle parking required (17) More visitors parking required to reduce likelihood of on-street parking. Preference for lay-by arrangements alongside carriageways. Further consideration given to visitor parking near commercial area. (18) Need for mobility impaired users to be considered. (19) TRO funding to restrict parking on the Spine Road adjacent to commercial areas. (20) Footways alongside Plots 17, 29-32 should be widened to a minimum of 1.8m (21) Consideration should be given to shared foot /cycle use to north side of Spine Road. (22) All private paths leading directly to properties should be demonstrated to be DDA compliance. (23) Are walking and cycling connections to be included from the REM site to the commercial element adjacent. (24) Street lighting to be provided for on the layout. (25) Further information regarding bus infrastructure is required.	where possible by removal of some garages. Where garage remain in place the driveway has to allow for a gate into the back garden, hence the driveway is set back from the garage entrance and appears 'overlong'. This is not considered to be a design weakness, rather it provides for additional space within the residential curtilage. (14) Comment as above. (15) Visitor space cycle hoops are provided in the LEAP and two LAPs in accordance with WSCC guidelines (2010) – refer to parking strategy drawing and the Parking Calculator print out. (16) Motor cycle parking (1 space per 30) shown communal parking areas – refer to Parking Strategy drawing. (17) Visitor parking is provided in accordance with WSCC 2010 guidelines – refer to parking strategy drawing and the Parking Calculator print out. Parking for the commercial area will be provided as part of the commercial land and retail land RMA's. As detailed on the s73 parameter plans and DFD, the civic area (located within the Local Centre, off the Main Avenue) will provide the majority of parking requirements for this area. (18) Provision for mobility impaired users, with in the visitor / unallocated spaces is provided in accordance with WSCCs 2010 guidance. Again refer to Parking Strategy drawing and the Parking Calculator print out. In addition may of the on plot spaces are large enough or have space about them to be considered mobility spaces (e.g. Plots 31 and 32 where the drive is 6.3m wide which is enough to accommodate mobility impaired users if required. Overlong drives (see comment 13 above) also help in this regard). (19) The commercial and retail areas will be brought forward under separate RMA's. TRO may be appropriate in these areas along roads that are to be adopted. Can be considered as part of any s38 process. (20) Layout has been amended. (21) The rationale behind the arrangement proposed, and as shown on the s73 parameter plans, is that the north side of the Main Avenue will become a bus route, therefore to avoid conflict the shared footpath / cycle path has been located on the south side of the Main Avenue. To date no issues have been raised with this rationale on the s73 parameter plans. The approved outline parameter plan just shows a pedestrian link along this section of the Main Avenue, therefore it is considered what is shown on the submitted (and amended drawings) for the RMA provide for a betterment and logical consideration of users along this road. (22) Where possible a minimum 2m at 1:12 footway will be provided up to the threshold of each
--	--

	property. Where this is not possible, the footpath at the front of the property has been designed in sympathy with the finished floor levels of the properties. (23) Pedestrian connection to the retail / commercial uses area via the footpaths provided within the development which in turn provide a link to the Main Avenue. There will be no 'internal connections' along the eastern boundary as these pose a secure by design issue and prevent efficient use of the land. (24) Indicative street lighting has been shown on submitted drawings A/PHLITTLE_INT.1/13-1 Rev P2 & A/PHLITTLEH-INT.1/13-2 Rev P2. (25) We are in the process of contacting the bus company to seek their approval of the bus stop location. The application will be further updated in this regard once communication has been received. If a response is delayed this information could be conditioned to the RMA.
Environment Health	
Insufficient detail is provided to discharge conditions 37 & 38. - Alternative means of ventilation required throughout the development for noise sensitive rooms. The method of such ventilation is to be prescribed and agreed with the EHO. - Enhanced glazing to be prescribed and detail of noise attenuation to be provided to the satisfaction of the EHO. - Building layout and design – provide layouts and position of noise sensitive rooms within these in relation to the main sources of noise in order to demonstrate the way in which building orientation and internal arrangement have been designed to reduce external noise impact. - Fencing – detail of where acoustic fences will be positioned is required. Detail of proposed acoustic fencing specification to be provided. - Proof of on-site validation of proposed methods of noise mitigation to be provided before any occupation of premises. *This can be conditioned.	The EHO is asking for very specific details which we are sourcing. Our noise consultant has made contact with the EHO to discuss further.
Littlehampton Town Council	
Raised the following objection: - the application should not proceed until the proposals and timetable for the s278 works along Toddington Lane / Mill Lane has been agreed.	A s278 application has been submitted to WSCC and nearing determination. As such we have prepared a programme which details the works that will be undertaken and when (this programme was provided to ADC in an email dated 21.06.17. It is standard Gantt

In addition the Town Council raised a comment in relation to pavement connectivity along Toddington Lane	chart with week 1 being the week following approval of the s278. It is anticipated week 1 will be towards the end of July as we are hoping to start and complete some of the works during the School holidays. With regard to pavement connectivity along Toddington Lane at the moment there is a footpath extending from Hollyacres eastwards along Toddington Lane. Part of the s278 works we are delivering will improve this. In terms of footpath between Hollyacres and the crossing (going westwards) this falls outside of the remit of the Outline consent we are delivering. However, we do believe that there is highway land within this area and as such it may be that WSCC can deliver an extension of the footway. It is not a matter that should be considered as part of this application or any others brought about under the Outline consent. That said Persimmon are willing to help where we can in delivering an extension to the footpath if this is considered necessary.
EA Acknowledge that the RMA relates to an outline planning permission that pre-dates revised climate change guidance. Confirmed that flood compensation with a net increase in flood storage was provided for in the proposed development. No objection	No amendments necessary
Highway England Highlights a 350 occupation restriction in relation to improvements at the A27 / A284 Crossbush junction. No objection.	The proposed development will result in 357 dwellings being provided on the overall development site. Persimmon are aware of the occupation restriction imposed by Outline Planning Permission condition 43 and will ensure that the required Junction improvements are carried out in good time before this.
Southern Water State that as a temporary solution a maximum of 100 residential dwellings can be allow to be connected to the public sewerage system at manhole TQ0203991. It goes onto state that no further flows from the development site will be allowed to discharge to the public sewer via the temporary connection until such time as the s98 of the Water Industry Act legal agreement for requisition of the public sewer is signed.	Persimmon has negotiated a further temporary solution with Southern Water while the permanent upgrade works to the foul system are untaken. We have a signed S98 Agreement with Southern Water which allows us to discharge at 6 l/second into the existing network. Foul will be stored in temporary wet wells on site, and then discharged at 6 l/second into the existing network. By signing the s98 Southern Water have accepted that foul distributed at 6 l/second can enter into the existing network thus removing the need for an occupancy restriction. This RMA provides for a permanent pumping station which will replace the temporary wet wells.

West Sussex Police	
The following design changes should be considered: (1) Design out vulnerable rear garden pathways (2) Garage and on-curtilage parking for Plots 101, 65, 55 have no observation / surveillance (3) The rear parking court of Plots 95-100 must have good observation (needs to be viewed by active rooms – e.g. kitchens and living rooms)	Comments have been reviewed and amendments made where considered suitable. • The majority of rear garden pathways have been designed out. Where they are still necessary a front gate at the entrance of the pathway is proposed to deter unwanted visitors. • Parking for plots 101, 65 and 55 have been reviewed. • Kitchens overlook the parking courtyard of Plots 95-100. Refer to floor plans.