

FROM: Ian Gledhill TO: Arun District Council
FAO: David Innes

SUBJECT: LU/201/16/RES - Approval of reserved matters following outline consent
LU/229/10/ for appearance, landscaping, layout & scale for 84 No. dwellings.

Amendment.

Windroos Nursery, Worthing Road, Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 6LY

RECOMMENDATION:

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

The Local Highway Authority has previously issued comments on this site dated the 17th August 2016. A number of comments were raised relating to the proposed layout. Although some of these points were for advice/observations, certain points required amendments. Taking these point (set out in italics),

- A separate pedestrian access is shown onto the A259. There is an unsegregated foot/cycle way along the north side of the A259 in this location. Ideally this access into the development would be widened to 3 metres to continue the unsegregated foot/cycle way into the development.*

The link has been increased to 3 metres.

- It is recommended that the parking spaces north of plot 62 are located behind the footway instead of the layout as shown. This would make defining the extent of adoption more straightforward, i.e. it would be the back edge of the footway. Given that the exact extents of adoption are not clear, it may well be that this access road is not being offered for adoption.*

The parking spaces have been moved to the back of the footway. This length of access road is in any case now shown as being private.

- The kerb radii at the junction at the frontage of plot 63 should be enlarged as much as possible. The logic of the layout shown is acknowledged (that there is no through route from the proposed development into the adjoining completed development and as such there would be no reason for traffic to turn right). However the Design Brief for Site 7 (which incorporated both the adjacent completed and currently proposed development) envisaged a through route. Whilst there is a ransom strip between the two sites at present, this may be overcome. The design should be altered to reflect this.*

The kerb radii have been removed altogether and the access road indicated as being private. Putting aside matters of land ownership/control, whilst this would not preclude a through access in principle for pedestrians, given the alignment proposed does not reflect that within the adjoining development, it would be difficult to connect the two sites together for vehicle traffic.

- *In connection with the above, there are quite a number of side roads where it appears that these will be accessed by formalised bellmouths with kerb radii. Given the low number of parking spaces served from these, these could alternately and more preferably have been accessed by crossovers. This would then give priority to pedestrian movements rather than vehicular traffic.*

The layout has been altered in certain instances to give greater priority to pedestrian movements.

In summary, although a through access would reflect good practice, it's evident that this cannot be achieved without being reliant upon 3rd party land. Such a link could not be insisted upon. The applicant's responses to the other matters are acceptable.

As a further point, the applicant should note that service margins would be required alongside all adoptable roads. It's noted that service margins are not shown along some potentially adoptable roads. Service margins would need to be indicated as part of any future adoption agreement.

Ian Gledhill
Strategic Planning