

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Michael Eastham
FROM:	WSCC - Highway Authority
DATE:	12 August 2021
LOCATION:	Phase 5 Hampton Park Toddington Lane Littlehampton BN17 7PL
SUBJECT:	LU/206/21 Approval of reserved matters following outline consent LU/47/11/ for the development of 260 No. dwellings and the construction of the Central Spine Road running through Hampton Park. This site is in CIL zone SP2 and is not CIL Liable as strategic site.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	SEE S106 AGREEMENT FOR OUTLINE PROPOSAL

This is the WSCC Highways (CHA) response to the above planning application for approval of reserved matters following outline consent LU/47/11/ for the development of 260 No. dwellings and the construction of the Central Spine Road running through Hampton Park.

Site location.

The site is located to the north of Littlehampton and forms part of the former Greencore Nurseries strategic development area for an overall development of circa 1200 homes, retail and commercial development. This application is for Phase 5 and the central spine road that will, when completed, provide the main traffic route through the development to and from Toddington lane and the new by-pass route currently under construction. Following an exchange of emails with the case officer it is understood that the application for the spine road includes the remainder in its entirety including its connection to Toddington Lane.

Spine road.

The proposed spine road is shown with traffic management features at various junction locations in the form of raised tables. The proposed design speed is 20mph which the applicant considers the traffic measures would limit traffic speeds to. Alongside the spine road can be found a footway (on the south-side) and a shared footway/cycleway on the northern-side. While the latter appears to be consistent with previous phases, Local Transport Note 1/20 (Cycle Infrastructure Design) has been published. As such, the applicant should provide further information to demonstrate how the cycle infrastructure for Phase 5 and the spine road meet the requirements of this document.

It is also noted that the applicant wishes to offer parts of the internal road layout for adoption. If this is the case, both design and construction criteria would need to meet with WSCC approval. From observation of the as-submitted proposed adoption plan, some parts might not be suitable for adoption (e.g. lone footways leading to dead-ends

and parts where service margins aren't shown around the roads). As such, the applicant should re-visit those parts where service margins aren't shown (one example being the section of access road running between plots 127 and 140 – here some parking spaces are shown abutting the carriageway. Without a suitable service margin, it would not be possible to adopt this street). Furthermore, a plan showing extent of adoption for the spine road should also be provided.

In its consideration of the submitted drawings, the CHA cannot locate a plan showing the detail of the spine road where it connects to Toddington Lane (in the south-western part of the site). As such, the applicant should provide a drawing showing this. Furthermore, the applicant should provide evidence to demonstrate that this has also been considered in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

Structures within the development.

On the 'drainage strategy plan' drawing there are a number of culverts shown including the Bebo arch (ref: 1796). However, it's not clear what the function of all the culverts are. As such, it is not known which ones are to be offered for adoption and which ones are to remain private. Those under the roads being offered for adoption will need to be offered for adoption, whereas others may have to remain private. Nevertheless, their adoption status should be made known in the first instance.

Two of the culverts observed are shown to have an internal headroom of 1.0m. However, to be in compliance with CD 529 (i.e. min 1.2m) and irrespective of ownership status, the designer is legally obliged under the CDM Regs to consider inspection and maintenance. Therefore, 1.2m headroom will be required for all culverts throughout the development.

Additionally, in the heart of the estate, there are several other structures (possibly pipe culverts or maybe small footbridges).

Details of all the above will need to be provided to the CHA for checking as part of the implementation technical approval process post-planning.

Housing phases.

These appear to follow a number of principles in Manual for Streets (MfS). The layouts provide a combination of traditional-style access roads with footways alongside, whereas other parts are shared surfaces with private driveways running off these – either to small cul-de-sac arrangements of houses or just to single dwellings. Road widths are not stated but appear to be 6.2m for the spine road with 4.8m-wide side roads. However, the applicant should confirm this, please. Where the side streets meet the spine road, visibility splays are shown which appear to be based on a 20mph design speed. Added in support of that are traffic calming features in the form of raised tables at several of the junctions. All visibility requirements should meet with the principles of MfS. Should the applicant wish to promote a 20mph speed limit, this will require specific dispensation – otherwise with street lighting the default position with regard to speed limit will be 30mph. One specific area that does need further information provided is on the sharp bend in the spine road adjacent to the LAP – here the applicant should provide a plan showing forward visibility splays around and across the bend. And finally, visibility at pedestrian and cycle crossing points where they cross the spine road should be shown. LTN 2/95 can assist in this regard.

Street lighting.

Street lighting should meet recognised standards throughout the development. SSE can advise.

Landscaping alongside roads.

Areas where trees and other landscaping are proposed to be planted should be verge – not hard landscaping. Some areas shown on the proposed adoption plan shows (in yellow colouring) hard landscaped areas but it does not explain why these isolated areas are like this. Trees and planting would thrive better in grassed areas. Wild flower planting in verges might not be acceptable to the CHA. Applicant to reply to this, please. Specific details will, of course, be checked at the S38 Agreement stage.

Parking.

Car parking - In terms of numbers, the car parking provision appears to meet the Arun DC parking guidance. However, one observation is that visitor parking is absent from the main spine road which could result in some parking on this road. Furthermore, a hard strip should be provided alongside layby parking bays (this is also picked-up in the Road Safety Audit).

Electric vehicle parking – Provision should be made in accordance with Arun DC guidance – so basically 20% 'active' with the rest of the development being made 'passively' ready for future installations. Applicant to demonstrate compliance with the guidance.

Cycle parking – This is provided in garages and communal facilities depending on the types of dwellings it is proposed to serve. However, for those dwellings without garages, sheds should be provided for the parking of cycles – applicant to show please. In addition, visitor cycle parking (in the form of Sheffield Stands (or very similar) should be provided throughout the development.

Sustainable access considerations.

Walking – This is provided in the form of footways, a shared footway/cycleway and shared surface areas. Additionally, links are provided to footpaths running through and around the site. However, in the aforementioned absence of a drawing showing the tie-in of the spine road with Toddington Lane, the CHA cannot comment further at this stage. Once this is available, further highways comments will be provided.

Cycling – As documented previously, this is shown provided in the main form alongside the spine road as a shared arrangement with several similar paths running through or around the development. In the residential parcels alongside, cyclists are required to cycle on-street. With regard to tie-in points and connections to/from side streets and across roads (including the spine road) from cycle paths, this needs to be shown in more detail as current plans aren't clear. Again, LTN 1/20 should be referred to by the designer.

Public transport (buses) – As part of the S106 Agreement, provision for a contribution towards public transport has been secured. The spine road proposed as part of this Phase (5) does provide for a route that appears to be suitable for buses to travel on. However, the applicant should provide evidence of correspondence with the local bus operators confirming they are happy with the design of the spine road (the Road Safety Audit also picks up this point to do with the raised tables shown on the spine road's alignment) but also their aspirations and requirements for bus provision for the development.

Public transport (trains) – The nearest railway station is Littlehampton which is approximately 4kms south-west of the site. Regular buses stop outside the station which can be accessed via Lyminster Road (700 service). The layout forming part of this planning application appears to be designed to cater for access by buses. However, please note comment made previously seeking confirmation from the applicant that the local bus companies are satisfied with the layout from a bus access perspective.

Fire appliance and refuse vehicle access.

Access for vehicles is shown on drawings 21044/DSP01A and 21044/DSP02A prepared by Banners Gate. Additional to this, the applicant will need to demonstrate to the LPA compliance with building regulations.

Road safety.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) has been submitted alongside the planning application. This raises a number of points. However, a Road Safety Audit Log of 'Agreed Actions' (Designer's Response) has not been made available. As such, the CHA is unable to consider the proposal further until this document is provided. As such, the case officer should request this at the earliest time, please, and when available make it available to the CHA to consider.

Access to school site.

Applicants to explain what obligation there is upon them regarding access to the proposed school site found on the south-side of Phase 5. An indicative access appears to be shown (as is a road table – albeit it is not coloured like the other ones – possibly a drawing error) and it would be useful to know how this fits-in with any proposals for that part of the development.

Conclusion.

Additional information is required to enable the CHA to be able to consider the proposal further. The details of this are found in the main body of text in this response with a summary of it found below:

1. A Technical Note explaining how the on-site cycle infrastructure meets with the guidance contained in Local Transport Note 1/20 (Cycling Infrastructure Design).
2. A Road Safety Audit Agreed Actions Log (Designer's Response to the Road Safety Audit).
3. A plan showing the tie-in point of the new spine road with Toddington Lane (and confirmation that the Road Safety Audit Team has considered that in the Stage 1 Road Safety Audit).
4. A plan showing forward visibility around and across the bend in the spine road adjacent to the LAP.
5. A plan showing visibility splays at the pedestrian and cycle crossing points on the spine road.
6. Evidence of discussions with bus companies showing confirmation that they are happy with the design of the spine road.
7. A plan showing the extent of adoption of the proposed spine road.
8. Plan showing extent of roads to be offered for adoption with comments about service margins etc. addressed.
9. Plan showing hard surfacing to rear of parking laybys.
10. Plan showing all road widths.
11. Explanation about hard landscaped areas and why they aren't shown as soft landscaping (yellow areas on adoption plan).
12. Confirmation that EV parking provision meets with the Arun DC requirements for both 'active' and 'passive' provision.
13. A plan showing cycle parking provision in the form of sheds for those properties without garages.
14. A plan showing visitor cycle parking provision to be provided throughout the development.
15. Reply to hard-landscaping point raised.
16. Reply to comment made about access to school site.

Please re-consult when the additional information is available, at which time the CHA will consider the proposal further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services