

Text of email from Tim Townsend (WSCC) to Ivan Cosmai (Mayer Brown) dated 08.03.2022

Dear Ivan,

Thank you for your email below and link to the additional information.

For expediency, I've taken the text from my earlier email to you and added my replies in *red italic* text alongside following review of your latest submissions.

- 1. Road Safety Audit (RSA)** – A Designer's Response (DR) is found at the foot of the RSA but it does not contain your responses to the problems raised, nor does it appear to follow the requirements of GG119. Below is a table produced to reflect the requirements of GG119 and I ask that you complete your sections (the first three columns) and return that version to me so I can add my parts, please. *Please see Highway Authority comments made in response to sister planning application LU/206/21. The actual Audit appended to the download for LU/369/21 appears to be the wrong one (basically it just covers the southern-section of the spine road where it meets the existing Toddington Lane adjacent to Tulley Cottage). The correct Audit for LU/369/21 is the one that covers the northern section of the spine road. I will await your response to the Highway Authority comments made yesterday in response to ALL the Road Safety Audits in my email to you under reference LU/206/21.*

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<i>Insert the original problem from the RSA report.</i>	<i>Insert the original recommendation from the RSA report.</i>	<i>Insert the design organisation's response.</i>	<i>Insert the Overseeing Organisation's response.</i>	<i>Insert the design organisation's and the Overseeing Organisation's agreed action to the problem.</i>

- 2. Guardrail** – I am struggling to find details of guardrail for the Bebo arch. Furthermore, can you provide more detail of the locations, type and heights of the proposed guardrail (dimensions and levels of land/cross-sections alongside the shared-use path running through the central wetland area are most important) and show how these would be LTN 1/20-compliant. *I cannot find this information in your download – please supply.*
- 3. Street lighting** – All columns must be located a minimum of 0.5m clear of all shared-use cycleways to be LTN 1/20-compliant – please can you amend your plans to show this throughout the scheme (includes Central Wetland Area too). *The street lighting plan is noted. However, the locations of the columns are still not shown at the minimum 0.5m distance away from the edge of the shared-use paths, shared-use footways and footways as mentioned in the previous Highway Authority's comments. This must be attended to at the build stage of the scheme to achieve LTN 1/20 compliance. Applicant to confirm that this will be the case.*

4. **Narrowing on bridge** – This is not dimensioned on the plans and might – if retained – need to be amended to provide for single-way working with give-ways etc. or provided in such a way as to permit two vehicles to pass one-another. At present it appears to narrow the road to 4.1-4.2m which would permit two cars to pass with care but not a car and a larger vehicle. Please would provide more details about this (again, dimensions, road markings and what the feature will actually look like in practice). *This has been picked-up in the Highway Authority's comments for sister planning application LU/206/21. In brief, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be required for the highway layout (give-way to traffic) at the 538 stage.*
5. **LTN 1/20 report** – Please provide details of expected user flows within an updated report and explain how the shared route as proposed would comply with LTN 1/20. *Again, this has been largely picked-up as part of LU/206/21 (although there is an outstanding issue with that scheme to do with cycling and junction priorities). However, subject to the street lighting columns being located a minimum of 0.5m away from the edge of the shared-use cycle path, cycling matters relevant to LU/369/21 appear to now be satisfactory from the Highway Authority's viewpoint.*
6. **Raised tables on main spine road** – The proposed blockwork should be continued into the side roads that emerge to the spine road where the raised areas are shown. Please update your drawings to show this. *This has now been shown.*

I trust the above helps and I look forward to receiving replies to the outstanding items. Please ensure that you keep responses to both applications separate to help minimise overlap.

Thank you,

Tim

Tim Townsend, MCiHT

Principal Transport Planner, County Highways Team – Highways, Transport and Planning
West Sussex County Council, Ground Floor Northleigh, County Hall, Chichester PO19 1RQ

