

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

DATE: 11th October 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:

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

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

This is the second WSCC highways and transport response to the above planning application and responds to the additional information provided by the applicant. Drainage comments will again be made separately by the drainage engineer.

The following information has been considered:

1. Summary response to consultee comments (undated)
2. Design Statement produced by Persimmon Homes (September 2017)
3. Transport Statement produced by Mayer Brown Transportation Consultants (March 2017)
4. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit produced by Mayer Brown Transportation Consultants (March 2017) – authored by Martyn Parr and Ken Fry – reference S/PHLITTLE-INT.1.1.6a – 17th March 2017
5. 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 20th March 2017
6. Stage 1 Road Safety Audit Addendum produced by Mayer Brown Transportation Consultants (September 2017) – authored by Martyn Parr and Ken Fry, reference S/PHLITTLE-INT.1.Ad.6a - 1st September 2017
7. Stage 1 RSA Designer's Response – authored by Mayer Brown Transportation (Adrian Barnley) – 5th September 2017

And drawings:

- Landscape Layout A088461 LA100.dwg – 22nd March 2017 (produced by White Young Green)
- Site Layout – HOUSE TYPE MIX - 543_PL_SITE LAYOUT_104 Rev. A – February 2017 (produced by Persimmon Homes)

- Surface Treatments Drawing (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/11-1 Rev. P10 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Surface Treatments Drawing (2 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/11-2 Rev. P10 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- General Arrangement Drawing (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/10-1 Rev.P9 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- General Arrangement Drawing (2 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/10-2 Rev.P9 – 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 Rev. A – February 2017 (Persimmon Homes)
- Site Layout – PARKING STRATEGY – 543_PL_SITE LAYOUT_105 Rev. B (Persimmon Homes)
- Site Layout – BIN COLLECTION – 543_PL_SITE LAYOUT_108 Rev. A (Persimmon Homes)
- Site Layout – STREET LIGHTING Drawing (1 of 2) A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/13-1 Rev. P4 – March 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Site Layout – STREET LIGHTING Drawing (2 of 2) A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/13-2 Rev. P4 – March 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Anticipated swept-path of a large refuse vehicle and large car accessing the site (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-1 REV. P6 – 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. P6 – February 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Anticipated swept-path of a fire tender accessing the site (1 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-3 REV. P2 – September 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Anticipated swept-path of a fire tender accessing the site (2 of 2) – A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-4 REV. P2 – September 2017 (Mayer Brown)
- Proposed limit of adoption – Drg. No. A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/LOA Rev. P2 – August 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, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit provided by the applicant accompanies the application. In addition to this and to reflect changes made since the original submission back in May 2017, an Addendum Stage 1 Safety Audit has been submitted too.

Having reviewed these, the CHA is satisfied with the Audits. However, with regard to the Designer's Responses, the CHA have the following comments:

Stage 1 RSA – Problem 2.1. – This raises concern that visibility splays are not shown consistently throughout the development. The designer states that the design speed of the development is intended to be 20mph. As such, visibility splays of 2.4m x 25m have been shown at various junctions. Because of changes since this Audit was written, the applicant now proposes a 30mph design speed for the main spine road. As such, the plans should be altered to reflect this. However, 'y' (major road) splays should be shown terminating on the kerbline. If this is not possible in certain areas, evidence should be provided by the applicant demonstrating suitability of any alternatives shown. The Audit Team should also be re-consulted for comments about this too.

Stage 1 RSA – Problem 2.5. – This raises concern that sufficient warning of raised features be made – the recommendation being to provide white triangles to Diag. 1062 on all speed reducing ramps. The designer partially accepts this. In the light of the change to the proposed design speed of the spine road (from 20mph to 30mph), the designer should re-visit the response. The Audit Team should also be re-consulted for comments about this too. An Exception Report might be required to be considered.

Stage 1 Addendum RSA - Problem 3.2. – This raises concern that the path of service vehicles might be obstructed if on-street parking takes place within the development. The recommendation then states that if on-street parking does occur then WSCC should consider implementing a traffic order (TRO) prohibiting waiting “at any time” within the extents of the swept paths. The designer’s response does not adequately respond to this – simply saying that parking will be provided in designated places as agreed with the LPA and CHA and also stating that ample parking is to be provided. The response to 3.2 should be re-considered.

Landscaping (main access/spine road only).

Comments to follow separately when available. (Please also see comments about hard landscaping made elsewhere in this report).

Access roads.

Widths – The main ‘avenue’/spine road running into the development appears to measure 6.1m wide which is suitable for large vehicles to pass one-another on straight sections subject to no obstructions being present (e.g. parked cars etc.). 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. P6, A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-2 REV. P6, A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-3 REV. P2 and A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/TK-4 REV. P2. Previously, the applicant showed the ‘track’ of a refuse vehicle attempting to enter/leave the parking access drives serving plots 99-100 and 117-122 overriding the access points for these properties and, in the case of the later plots, over-sailing of the footway opposite. What is shown now as an alternative is/are bin stores located within suitable distances to the main access roads. The applicant has confirmed that bin stores/bin collection areas to serve these specific properties will be located just inside the parking areas to enable roadside pick-up by the refuse contractor. Subject to the refuse contractor being happy with this (the LPA should check this), the CHA has no further comment to make.

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 which is in bituminous material). The applicant has explained that this latter one is like this for reasons of durability seeing as it is on the main spine road. This is accepted by the Highway Authority. It is recommended that further tactile paving be provided at appropriate crossing points as only one is currently shown. Also, careful attention should be paid to crossing point location so that any trees or other landscaping does not obscure visibility for pedestrians nor that of drivers approaching said area. Further crossings should be considered along this length on desire lines. The foot/cycleway and parking configuration outside plots 81-86 and 87-94 is still not

acceptable to the Highway Authority. This is because as currently shown, it 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 or sight line margin in front. Likewise, drivers/road users on the spine road could have difficulty seeing an emerging vehicle. This should still be amended. Although it has been noted that a 0.5m margin has been provided between the road and start of parking spaces, this does not appear to be sufficient.

With regard to hard landscaping (granite setts with trees pits adjacent are shown for parts of the main spine road leading into the development from the IDR), this type of treatment should be removed and replaced with grass. Granite setts are potentially a safety hazard if pedestrians choose to cross over them, a maintenance liability and can create issues with tree growth adjacent.

Speed controls etc. – Raised ‘tables’ 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. Advice from one of the local bus service providers suggests that buses can use road cushions subject to them meeting a certain design criteria (max. cushion width of 1600mm with minim 600mm offset between kerb and nearside edge of the cushion and parking prohibited for at least 25m either side of each – source DfT). With regard to the speed tables, their positions should be such that they meet relevant design guidance with regard to spacing (for speed control purposes) and height (the latter no greater than 65mm). Flexible surfacing is acceptable for tables on the main spine road (largely for maintenance reasons) and blockwork for those on the internal estate roads.

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. All splays to comply with road design speeds.

Adopted or non-adopted – Proposed adoption limit is now shown on Drawing No. A/PHLTTL-INT.1/LOA Rev. P2. Subject to it being suitably constructed in accordance with WSCC specifications (including drainage), then no highway objection is raised to this.

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. From previous plans the only exceptions to this were plots 28 and 65 – both showing driveways less than this. These now appear to have been amended. Parking for plot 17 was previously excessively large/long but again, this now appears to have been amended and/or suitably explained. Likewise, garages for plots 22, 23, 30, 31, 39, 40, 53, 54, 101, 102, 103 and 104 are all set well-back into the plots providing over-long driveways. Again, these have either been amended or suitably explained.

As documented previously in this report, parking for plots 80-94 still causes concern given the nearness of the parking spaces to the edge of the carriageway which will make it difficult for drivers to see oncoming traffic (and vice-versa). Also, some of it (spaces 81-84) will – in-part - obstruct visibility at the junction found just west. These should be amended and appropriate junction visibility provided adjacent. Finally, those emerging from those spaces (other than those parking immediately adjacent to footways) are not provided with hard areas to walk on – thereby

likely leading to walking across landscaped areas or in the carriageway. Adopted or un-adopted, this should be revisited and changes made for the reasons given.

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.

Motocycles - Will be available on-curtilage for residential properties.

Visitor parking.

This is still only shown in limited locations and numbers. As such, the Highway Authority still recommend that 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. The reply stating that parking complies with WSCC guidance does not adequately cover design and location of spaces/address this issue. Furthermore, Safety Audit comments make mention of concern about ‘track’ of refuse vehicles possibly being obstructed by cars parked on the carriageway.

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 were previously shown measuring 1.0-1.2m. These have now been amended to measure 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. It is noted why the applicant is not proposing a path on the northern side of the road. It is also recommended that all private access paths leading directly to properties should be demonstrated DDA compliant. No specific links for walking and cycling connections to be included from the REM site to the commercial element adjacent to it are to be made according to the applicant.

Finally with regard to pedestrian and cycle movement – specifically where trees are proposed next or close to pedestrian crossing points - that adequate visibility is provided for users. Please show.

Street lighting.

To be provided for the layout. Drawing No.'s A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/13-1 Rev. P4 (1 of 2) – March 2017 (Mayer Brown) and Drawing (2 of 2) A/PHLITTLE-INT.1/13-2 Rev. P4 – March 2017 (also Mayer Brown) show an indicative layout. Lighting on the public highway will be checked by WSCC officers at the S38/278 stage. Lighting on non-adopted sections of access roads should be certified appropriate/fit-for-purpose by a qualified street lighting engineer at time of detailed design and evidence of such provided to the LPA. All this should be secured using a planning condition.

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. Further discussion about this will be required as-and-when bus services are required to enter the site.

Drainage.

Comments should be sought separately from drainage engineers.

Conclusion.

The detail of the matters still needing to be addressed can be found in the text above. However, they are also summarised below:

1. Road Safety Audit matters
2. Landscaping
3. Parking for plots 80-94
4. Visitor parking
5. Visibility at junctions
6. Visibility for Pedestrians throughout layout adjacent to where trees are proposed alongside carriageways

Please re-consult when further information is available.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
Strategic Planning