

Bronte Welham

From: Amanda Scholes on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 02 November 2017 08:48
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: LU/17/162/PL - Erection of 10 houses following demolition of existing commercila buildings - land at Toddington Farm Cottages, Toddingotn Lane, Wick, Littlehampton - WSCC highways repsonse dated 31st October 2017
Attachments: LU 162 17 PL response 3.docx

Sent: 31 October 2017 14:59

To: Planning.Responses

Cc: Anita Gardner; Gary Markwell

Subject: LU/17/162/PL - Erection of 10 houses following demolition of existing commercila buildings - land at Toddington Farm Cottages, Toddingotn Lane, Wick, Littlehampton - WSCC highways repsonse dated 31st October 2017

Dear Arun Planning Dept.,

Please find attached WSCC highways report dated 31st October 2017 in response to the above planning application.

Should anyone receiving this email wish to discuss it, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend

Principal Planner, Highways – Planning Services

West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RH

Web: www.westsussex.gov.uk

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.

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
PLANNING SERVICES CONSULTATION**

DATE: 31st October 2017

**FROM: Tim Townsend TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Mrs. A. Gardner**

SUBJECT: LU/17/162 - Demolition of existing building, erection of 10 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated open space, landscaping, parking, and access. Departure from the Development Plan.

LOCATION: Land North & West of Toddington Farm Cottages, Toddington Lane, Wick, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 7PP.

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 12th September 2017

AMENDED INFORMATION RECEIVED.

RECOMMENDATION:

**Advice
Objection**

X

**Modification
No Objection**

**More Information
Refusal**

S106 contribution total (see below for breakdown): £79,203

This is the third WSCC highways and transport response to the above application. It follows review of additional information provided by the applicant – namely 'Site Layout – Proposed' drawing number (00) 002 Revision 'F' and 'Transport Response to West Sussex County Council' reference number 30917/D03 dated October 2017. This report should be read alongside previous WSCC highways reports dated 24th July and 19th September 2017.

Summary position of Highway Authority.

The County Highway Authority (CHA) objects to the proposal given lack of key infrastructure (namely continuous pedestrian provision, lack of suitable access visibility, substandard parking, poor internal layout), which would lead to conditions prejudicial to highway safety and inconvenience for pedestrians and other road users alike. The lack of suitable infrastructure is therefore considered severe when assessed alongside the NPPF, thereby resulting in a highway objection.

Site location and proposed use.

The site is located off Toddington Lane, Wick, Littlehampton, just to the north of the South Coast E-W railway line and Toddington Lane railway crossing. Currently in use in some commercial guise but with several residential properties to the south of the site, the applicant seeks permission for 10 residential dwellings by removal of the commercial elements on-site but retaining the existing residential properties.

Access.

Vehicular access is proposed off Toddington Lane in the same position as existing – albeit with changes such as widening, new surfacing and kerbing. This access would then run south of the new homes with a short spur leading to some parking (and doubling as a turning head) with a further spur running around to the western side of the site providing access to two dwellings and

their associated parking. Pedestrian access is shown via the vehicular access, a ramp and a single stepped access point onto Toddington Lane. Further comments about these will be made elsewhere in this report.

Road Safety.

Following the request made in the Highway Authority's first response to the application, a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was supplied by the applicant. In addition, a Designer's Response was provided. Both have been reviewed by the CHA. The RSA raised several problems with the site, a summary of which is provided below:

1. 2.1 – Potential collisions due to standing water or service covers
2. 2.2 – Potential vehicle collisions due to inadequate road space or visibility
3. 4.1 – Vehicle collisions associated with poor visibility
4. 5.1 – Hazard for pedestrians associated with vertical levels/steps
5. 5.2 – Increased risk of injury to pedestrians associated with poor facilities
6. 6.1 – Potential collisions associated with poor positioning of signs

In their latest submission, the Designer has provided responses to the problems raised but does not accept all the recommendations made. The outstanding RSA points taken from the previous WSCC response dated 19th September 2017 are as follows with current WSCC replies in red text alongside:

1. 2.2 – While a swept-path diagram is provided showing the manoeuvre of a service vehicle within the site, the problem raised in the RSA recommends that such vehicles will be able to manoeuvre to and from the *development access* safely. As such, a further swept-path diagram should be provided for the vehicular access where it meets Toddington Lane. While further swept path diagrams (SPD) have been provided, it is clear that to provide adequate access and egress for service vehicles, the access should be widened to at least 4.8m wide to ensure that vehicles can pass one-another in the access (the current SPD shows a large vehicle taking-up most of the width of the access). Also, the SPD and any revised plan should be presented to the Road Safety Audit Team for further review and comment.
2. 4.1 – A drawing showing visibility splays has not been provided. This is required. A plan has now been provided. However, it is not supported by traffic speed information – rather it makes an assumption about vehicle/traffic speeds and bases the splays on that. Although the splay in the leading traffic direction is acceptable at 43m, the splay in the trailing direction (looking north) is shown at 30m (albeit taken to the centreline of Toddington Lane) which is less than recommended in MfS for a 30mph road. Further information is, therefore, required to support anything shown. Alternatively, the full 43m be shown across the corner of the site.
3. 5.1 – The RSA recommends that the steps be removed and ramped access provided as an alternative – please show this. A ramp has now been provided leaving just a single set of steps (instead of the previous two).
4. 5.2 – A footway is shown around the boundary of the site adjacent to Toddington Lane. However, it is not shown connecting to the wider footway network to accord with the pedestrian desire-line (west of the site towards shops/services/bus route etc.). The site is required to provide a continuous link and cannot rely on other development proposals that might or might not build their infrastructure prior to the application site, the subject of this proposal. Therefore, a plan showing a continuous footway link from the site running west should be provided. A continuous link is not shown which would mean that suitable pedestrian provision is not provided for the development. This lack of provision could lead to conditions prejudicial to the safety and free-flow of movement by pedestrians and other road users alike and taken on its own, warrants a highway objection on road safety and accessibility grounds.

Although a financial contribution is offered by the applicant (they state that the Highway Authority could construct a footway link), insufficient highway land appears to be available to construct one, therefore requiring third party land. Furthermore, as the footway is critical to the success of the development, it is for the applicant to provide it.

5. 6.1 – In most cases, signage can be attended to at the detailed design stage. However, as the railway crossing is so close-by and has specific signage requirements and a pole-mounted camera, the applicant should provide this detail now for consultation to ensure that it is properly and safely accommodated alongside the development proposal. This has not been provided.

Development layout and further detailed assessment of access.

The proposed development layout is shown on drawing title “Site Layout Proposed” No. 6436 (00) 002 Revision ‘F’ produced by ECE Architecture. The first section of access road is shown as a ‘shared surface’ intended for joint-use by vehicles and pedestrians sans footways. Although a footway is shown running to the north of the access, terminating where it meets the revised junction, it still introduces pedestrians into the path of vehicles emerging from the site where visibility does not appear to be provided. Although demarcation is now shown where the access road becomes shared surface, this appears to be a continuation of the footway. This should be shown as a row of setts (or similar) with any footway terminating behind it (so within the site west of the feature). It is still recommended that the blockwork within the development be constructed raised above the surface level of the bellmouth construction to denote a shared environment with the change between surfaces also acting as a speed control. A demarcation line should also be shown highlighting the extent of public highway where it meets private land although this could be attended to at any detailed design/S278 stage. Visibility at the point pedestrians emerge to the access road is still not shown. Finally, the access width should be increased to a minimum of 4.8m to provide opportunity for vehicles to pass one-another at or close to the bellmouth.

At the point the access joins Toddington Lane, the applicant has shown visibility splays of 43m in the leading traffic direction (looking south) and 30m in the trailing direction (looking north). Visibility should be provided in accordance with guidance contained in Manual for Streets (MfS). A 2.4m ‘x’/minor road distance would be suitable on this occasion for the number of dwellings proposed. Based on a 30mph speed limit on this section of Toddington Lane, this will necessitate re-locating plots 1-3 as they would obstruct the recommended ‘y’/major road distance of 43m in the trailing traffic direction (looking north from the access road). The applicant shows a 30m splay in this direction stating that vehicles would be slowing at this point because of the bend in the road. However, no evidence is provided to support this and until it is, this lesser dimension is not accepted. In any event, the splay is shown to the centreline of Toddington Lane whereas it should be shown to the nearside (site side) of the road. Therefore, it measures less than 30m. A visibility splay is now shown in the leading traffic direction looking south from the entrance at 43m, which is acceptable to the CHA. Any vegetation or landscaping in advance of the splays should also be carefully considered to prevent obstruction of said visibility splays. Anything other than grass would need to be considered by way of a ‘licence to plant’ if shown on land forming part of the public highway which would need to be discussed with the Local Highway Manager at WSCC. Pedestrian visibility splays are now shown either side of any pedestrian access points.

A footway is shown running northwards from the access point, terminating at the western end of the site adjacent to the former Hollyacres Nursery site. This currently scales at 1.5m wide – it should be 2.0m wide. Also, any path should be shown connecting to the existing footway currently terminating where Phase 1 of the Hollyacres site has been built. In any event, the applicant will need to provide a suitable footway connection westwards from their site connecting to the one already built.

TPP drawing 30917/AC/004 indicatively shows a continuous footway from the site to the approximate position of the current termination points of the footway outside Phase 1 of the nearby Hollyacres development. However, the applicant states that they cannot provide this link from

their site because the land between would involve land controlled by a third party. In the absence of a continuous off-road link for pedestrians, this then puts such users (and other road users) at risk of collision, particularly where a bend in the road is present and where there is limited or no street lighting. Based on this alone, the CHA considers the impact of not providing something suitable as severe when assessed alongside the NPPF.

With regard to the configuration of the houses within the scheme, seven of these are still shown fronting Toddington Lane. Given that the parking for these properties is shown behind them and given that on occasion, some residents tend not to favour this arrangement, possibly leading to parking on the highway as has occurred outside the neighbouring Hollyacres development. Therefore, it is still recommended the layout be re-configured to show the majority (if not all) of the houses facing inwards with parking to the front of them. This is particularly important given that the site is on a bend in Toddington Lane where on-street parking should be discouraged as far as is practicable for road safety reasons. It may be that the LPA would wish for some frontage development so early discussion with the planning case officer and, indeed, the CHA should be undertaken. If some housing is retained facing the road, careful design of car parking for those properties should be given.

Steps down to Toddington Lane – One set of these has now been removed. In their place is a ramp to suit all users (although one set is still retained). Visibility is shown provided where both paths emerge to the back of the footway running around the boundary of the site.

The CHA previously recommended that all changes to the layout should be sent back to the Road Safety Audit Team for a further response. This does not appear to have been done.

Parking.

As documented above, the location of some of the parking spaces could lead to indiscriminate parking on the public highway on a bend in the alignment of Toddington Lane and possibly close to the railway crossing. Previously the CHA considered that the parking spaces dimensions were too short (they should be 2.4m wide by 4.8m long – slightly wider where they immediately adjoin buildings/walls etc.). The applicant has now confirmed that they are fit-for-purpose being, in some cases, wider and longer than recommended in MfS. The number of allocated parking has now been established using the WSCC Parking Calculator although where they are located is still not fully accepted. Visitor parking is still lacking in certain parts of the layout (particularly for plots 4-10). Finally, parking and access arrangements for Toddington Farm cottages has not been shown alongside that for the new development. Therefore, it is not demonstrated that both old and new work-alongside one-another.

Street lighting.

Additional street lighting columns will need to be provided on the highway alongside the development – and possibly south of the access point. A plan should be provided to the LPA and CHA to consider. The CHA recommend that the LPA show this plan to Network Rail for their comments given proximity of the railway crossing to the site.

SSE Contracting would be able to provide a street lighting scheme design. Please note that a charge is likely to be made for this.

Traffic Regulation Order (waiting restrictions etc.) contribution.

Alongside any re-design of the internal layout and if all other outstanding highway matters are resolved to the LHA's satisfaction, in an attempt to manage any possible on-street parking from taking place if it is caused by the development after occupation, a suitable sum of money (currently circa. £8000) towards a possible Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for waiting restrictions should be secured from the development and retained for a set period of time. This should be secured by S106 Agreement.

Network Rail.

Given the proximity of the railway and railway crossing and in light of changes to the surrounding road infrastructure including lighting and signage (see above), the CHA recommends that the LPA consult Network Rail for comments about the proposal. The applicant has responded to this saying that they don't consider this to be a statutory requirement. However, given the proximity of the railway to the site it would seem reasonable for the LPA to consult them on this occasion.

Conclusion.

In its consideration of the proposal and in-line with good planning practice, County officers have engaged with the applicant/their agents and Transport Consultant in an attempt to try to resolve the outstanding issues. However, in the absence of appropriate infrastructure, the LHA considers the impact of this on the local highway network would result in a severe impact on highway safety, contrary to paragraph's 32 and 35 of the NPPF and paragraph 1.2.1 of the WSCC Local Transport Plan 2011-26.

As such, the following highway objections are raised:

1. The access is not suitable to serve the proposed development by reason of its inadequate width and limited visibility.
2. The proposal would not achieve safe and convenient access on-foot – thereby providing only limited opportunities for non-motorised access to public transport and local facilities (shops, jobs etc.). This would lead to reliance in use of private transport (e.g. cars) to travel to and from the site and where suitable infrastructure is not provided for pedestrians (e.g. a footway), result in conditions detrimental to road safety.
3. The proposal does not include adequate provision on the site for the parking of vehicles in a satisfactory manner which would be likely to result in standing vehicles, either on the adjacent public highway or within the development which would interrupt the free flow of traffic and add to the hazards of both users of the highway and the development site.

Tim Townsend
Planning Services

**STRATEGIC PLANNING DIVISION:
SECTION 106 CONSULTATION RESPONSE ON EDUCATION CONTRIBUTIONS ONLY**

DATE: 21/06/2017

FROM: Eloise Short, Monitoring and Records

TO: Planning Applications Team

DISTRICT/BOROUGH COUNCIL: Arun

Application Number: LU/162/17

The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to Development at Land North & West of Toddington Farm Cottages, Toddington Lane, Wick, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 7PP

Planning Application details - Demolition of existing building, erection of 10 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated open space, landscaping, parking, and access. Departure from the Development Plan.

Summary of Density per Infrastructure Demands

Education			
Locality	Littlehampton		
Population Adjustment	24.6		
	Primary	Secondary	6th Form
Child Product	0.3102	0.3102	0.1675
Total Places Required	2.1714	1.5510	0.3350

Summary of Contributions

S106 type	Monies Due
Education - Primary	£34,017
Education - Secondary	£36,610
Education - 6 th Form	£8,576
Total Contribution	£79,203

Note: The above summary does not include the installation costs of fire hydrants. Where these are required on developments, (quantity as identified above) as required under the Fire Services Act 2004 they will be installed as a planning condition and at direct cost to the developer. Hydrants should be attached to a mains capable of delivering sufficient flow and pressure for fire fighting as required in the National Guidance Document on the Provision of Water for Fire Fighting 3rd Edition (Appendix 5)

The above contributions are required pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 to mitigate the impacts of the subject proposal with the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

Planning obligations requiring the above money is understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined by the in the *National Planning Policy Framework, 2012*.

The basis for this advice is contained in the County Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document "The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1".

The calculations have been derived on the basis of an increase in (10) Net dwellings.

Please see below for a Breakdown and explanation of the WSCC Contribution Calculators. Also see the attached spreadsheet for the breakdown of the calculation figures. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (<http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106>).

Deed of Planning Obligations

- a) As a deed of planning obligations would be required to ensure payment of the necessary financial contribution, the County Council would require the proposed development to reimburse its reasonable legal fees incurred in the preparation of the deed.
- b) The deed would provide for payment of the financial contribution upon commencement of the development.
- c) In order to reflect the changing costs, the deed would include arrangements for review of the financial contributions at the date the payment is made if the relevant date falls after 31st March 2017.
- d) **Review of the contributions towards school building costs should be by reference to the DfF adopted Primary/Secondary/Further Secondary school building costs applicable at the date of payment of the contribution and where this has not been published in the financial year in which the contribution has been made then the contribution should be index linked to the DfE cost multiplier and relevant increase in the RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.**

The contributions generated by this proposal shall be spent on additional equipment at Lyminster Primary School.

The contributions generated by this proposal shall be spent on additional equipment at The Littlehampton Academy.

The contributions generated by this proposal shall be spent on additional equipment at The Littlehampton Academy Sixth Form.

Recent experience suggests that where a change in contributions required in relation to a development or the necessity for indexation of financial contributions from the proposed development towards the costs of providing service infrastructure such as libraries is not specifically set out within recommendations approved by committee, applicants are unlikely to agree to such provisions being included in the deed itself. Therefore, it is important that your report and recommendations should cover a possible change in requirements and the need for appropriate indexation arrangements in relation to financial contributions.

Please ensure that applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and thus require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the housing mix is known and not be left until signing of the section 106 Agreement is imminent.

Where the developer intends to keep some of the estate roads private we will require provisions in any s106 agreement to ensure that they are properly built, never offered for adoption and that a certificate from a suitably qualified professional is provided confirming their construction standard.

It should be noted that the figures quoted in this letter are based on current information and will be adhered to for 3 months. Thereafter, if they are not consolidated in a signed S106 agreement they will be subject to revision as necessary to reflect the latest information as to cost and need.

Please see below for a Breakdown of the Contribution Calculators for clarification of West Sussex County Council's methodology in calculating Contributions. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (<http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106>).

Breakdown of Contribution Calculation Formulas:

1. School Infrastructure Contributions

The financial contributions for school infrastructure are broken up into three categories (primary, secondary, sixth form). Depending on the existing local infrastructure only some or none of these categories of education will be required. Where the contributions are required the calculations are based on the additional amount of children and thus school places that the development would generate (shown as **TPR- Total Places Required**). The TPR is then multiplied by the Department for Children, Schools and Families school building costs per pupil place (**cost multiplier**).

School Contributions = TPR x cost multiplier

a) TPR- Total Places Required:

TPR is determined by the number of year groups in each school category multiplied by the child product.

TPR = (No of year groups) x (child product)

Year groups are as below:

- Primary school- **7** year groups (aged 4 to 11)
- Secondary School- **5** year groups (aged 11 to 16)
- Sixth Form School Places- **2** year groups (aged 16 to 18)

Child Product is the **adjusted education population** multiplied by average amount of children, taken to be 14 children per year of age per 1000 persons (average figure taken from 2001 Census).

Child Product = Adjusted Population x 14 / 1000

Note: The adjusted education population for the child product excludes population generated from 1 bed units, Sheltered and 55+ Age Restricted Housing and Social Rented Housing as a nil child product is assumed for these dwellings.

b) Cost multiplier- Education Services

The cost multiplier is a figure released by the Department for Education. It is a school building costs per pupil place as at 2016/2017, updated by Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors' Building Cost Information Service All-In Tender Price Index. Each Cost multiplier is as below:

- Primary Schools- **£15,558 per child**
- Secondary Schools- **£23,442 per child**
- Sixth Form Schools- **£25,424 per child**