

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATION**

DATE: 08/12/2009

FROM: Local Development TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Mrs A Gardner

SUBJECT: LU/304/09 New Cottage, Toddington Lane, Wick, Littlehampton

**Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and redevelopment to provide 4
no. 3 bedroom houses and 2 no. 4 bedroom houses with new access off
Toddington Lane**

CONSULTATION DATE: 19/11/2009

RECOMMENDATION:

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

S106 contribution: N/A

The Highway aspect of this application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Scheme protocol for small scale proposals which include up to 5 residential units or extensions to single units accessed from roads that do not form part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). As such the comments provided by Local Development should be considered to be advice only, with respect to this planning application.

West Sussex County Council has been consulted on this application and considers issues of highway safety, highway capacity and archaeology. An archaeological condition has been recommended, but for reasons of highway safety, an objection has been raised.

Archaeology

Although this is a relatively small site (0.15 ha) it is in an area that is rich in prehistoric and Roman archaeological evidence as witnessed most recently by the archaeological recording in advance of the Toddington nurseries development. There is also the potential for deeper excavations for drainage and services to encounter raised beach deposits of geo-archaeological interest.

I recommend that a condition should be attached to the development to provide for limited trial trenching targeted at the footprint of the proposed housing and any areas where groundworks are likely to uncover *in situ* archaeological deposits and features preserved below the existing garden soil. At the same time any test pits required for geotechnical investigation should be monitored by an appropriately qualified geo-archaeological specialist. As the footprint of the houses on the western side of the site effectively coincides with the footprint of the existing dwelling house, investigation in this area may be limited to a watching brief on the excavation of foundations and services. In the eastern half, the archaeological recording and monitoring can be addressed by a limited trial trenching exercise followed, if appropriate (based on the results of the initial work), by a specified amount of further opening up of the area of the houses.

A negative condition following the model set out in PPG16 para 30 or Circular 11/95, Annex A, cond. 55 would be appropriate.

Highways

West Sussex County Council was consulted previously on Highway Matters for this location under planning application no. LU/2/04 to which an objections was raised with regards to the existing access. Subsequent pre-application advice was provided on 11/08/2009 and explained that the principle of a new access serving additional dwellings onto Toddington Lane was acceptable.

This proposal has been considered by means of a desktop study, using the information and plans submitted with this application, in conjunction with other available WSCC map information. A site visit can be arranged on request.

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and garage and redevelopment to provide 4 no. 3 bed houses and 2 no. 4 bed houses with access onto Toddington Lane via a new access point. The most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the new point of access.

However, from the limited amount of information that we have available, it appears that the sightline to the south falls over land that is neither under the control of the applicant or the highway authority, i.e. it falls under the control of a third party. Until such times as the applicant can demonstrate that a sightline of 2.4m x 33m with no obstruction above a height of 900mm above carriageway level can be provided and fully controlled, then the application should be resisted.

Reason for Refusal:

RN5 – The proposal does not make provision for adequate visibility at the junction of the access with the public highway.

Keith Comins
Local Development