

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Katie Sharp
FROM:	WSCC - Highway Authority
DATE:	7th June 2022
LOCATION:	Central Wetland Area Hampton Park Toddington Lane Littlehampton BN17 7PL
SUBJECT:	LU/369/21/RES Approval of reserved matters following outline consent LU/47/11/ (amended under LU/182/15/PL) for the main on-site infrastructure at Hampton Park and encompasses: 1) the Central Wetland Area, 2) the main spine road and crossing structures & 3) the SUDs features. Revised plans received.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	More information required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	SEE LATEST VERSION OF S106 AGREEMENT

This is the fourth WSCC County Highways (CHA) response to the above planning application for approval of reserved matters following outline consent LU/47/11/ (amended under LU/182/15/PL) for the main on-site infrastructure at Hampton Park and encompasses: 1) the Central Wetland Area, 2) the main spine road and crossing structures & 3) the SUDs features.

Comments below in *red italic* text responded to earlier request for additional information submitted directly by the author Ivan Cosmai of Mayer Brown (MB) Traffic and Transport Engineers to the CHA in his email dated 17 January 2022. Latest CHA responses found in *blue* text and respond to latest plans found on the Arun DC Planning web pages.

Response.

In an early response, the CHA stated that having looked at the previously submitted plans and supporting information for the planning application, it was unclear as to the full extent of the areas the CHA was being asked to consider.

Turning to the proposal, the case officer (Mr. Eastham) explained that the applicant has split the proposals as follows:

- **LU/369/21/RES** (i.e. Central Wetland Area and western part of the Central Spine Road; and,
- **LU/206/21/RES** (Phase 5 and southern part of Central Spine Road linking up with Toddington Lane).

As such, the CHA has considered that as described in bullet point 1 above. Namely:

- The first section of spine road running over the 'bridge' (so section connecting Phase 4 with the start of Phase 5)
- The structures including 'bridge' leading to and through the central wetland area

1. Spine road (first section as described above) – It is unclear from the drawings as to the extent of road requiring consideration, particularly as the red edging seems to extend around the whole spine road. However, considering the first section of road shown on the drawings running over the northern 'bridge', it appears to follow a predominantly straight alignment although this curves slightly southwards east of the proposed 'BeBo' arch. It also appears to have slight gradients on both approaches although this isn't wholly clear from the drawings. A carriageway 'narrowing' appears to be shown centrally on the road crossing the 'bridge'. *MB has confirmed the CHA interpretation of the section of road to consider is correct. The extent of road through/over the Central Wetland runs from the edge of Phase 4 (to the west) to just beyond the BEBO arch (to the east).*

On the northern side of the road runs a footway and verge. On the southern side runs a shared foot and cycle way and verge.

In order for the CHA to consider the design further, a short design check using DMRB and LTN 1/20 and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (and Designer's Response) should be provided.

The applicant should also clearly show what section of road is being considered in said documents.

MB has provided the following plans/details capturing the northern crossing (first section of spine road), which detail road gradients and widths over the crossing:

- *PHLITTLE-MAIN.1/10-1 – General Arrangement Drawing (Sheet 1 of 3)*
- *PHLITTLE-MAIN.1/10-1 – Drainage General Arrangement Drawing (Sheet 1 of 5)*
- *PHLITTLE-MAIN.1/30-1 – Construction Treatments Drawing (Sheet 1 of 3)*
- *PHLITTLE-MAIN.1/41 – Main Avenue Proposed Longitudinal Section*
- *MB/C/02 – Northern Crossing and BEBO Construction Detail*

The section of road under consideration (approximately 80m) links Phases 4 and 5 of the development and consists of a straight length of road climbing at 1/150 from west to east (please refer to Longitudinal Section drawing provided ref. PHLITTLE-MAIN.1/41).

The consultant states that the speed limit is to be 20mph, with a narrowing present in correspondence of the BEBO arch, which restricts locally width of the road to 4.1m (this is the minimum width required to allow two cars to pass each other in accordance with Manual for Streets). No junctions or access are present along this section of road. The consultant considers that a design check in accordance with DMRB standards is deemed not required in this instance given the simple road horizontal and vertical geometry, and the 20mph speed limit.

To have an actual speed limit of 20mph, special dispensation and an appropriate speed limit Order would be required. However, with narrowings and – further along the road – raised features at junctions etc., when constructed, the speed of traffic would be managed. The design of the road would also concur with previous parts of the road found west. However, unless the appropriate Order and full compliance with WSCC Speed Limit Policy is adhered to, the posted speed limit would otherwise be 30mph with the presence of street lighting. The design does appear to follow the principles of Manual for Streets.

With regard to guard rail across the BeBo arch, the applicant is still required to provide details showing what is to be provided to safeguard pedestrians and cyclist crossing the 'bridge'.

A 3m wide cycleway is present along the southern side of the road to ensure interconnectivity of the cycle infrastructure between Phases 4 and 5 of the development. Mayer Brown have completed a "LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design Review Technical Note" for Phase 5 of the development (also provided) to demonstrate the on-site infrastructure meets with the guidance contained in the Local Transport Note 1/20 (Cycling Infrastructure Design).

Further comments in response to the above can be found in response to 'sister' planning application LU/206/21 dated 7th June 2022.

The shared use paths in the wetland ensure site connectivity through the central wetland and wider development as shown on the "Master Plan, Pedestrian & Cycle Access Routes" drawing provided. The applicant states that these have been designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and taking into account design constraints, such as root protection areas – please refer to Mayer Brown "Proposed Footpaths Longitudinal Sections and Chainages" drawing ref. PHLITTLE-CWA.10/40.

With regard to the Central Wetland Area, the paths within it need to be provided with street lighting for both safety and to encourage use, particularly given that the route runs to and from the proposed community facility and school. And, guardrail (or similar) should be provided along both sides of the path. These should follow the advice given in LTN 1/20 with regard to design and location thereof.

Plan has been provided (519_PL_CWA_BWD_01) showing details of wooden structures (with guard-railing) running through the Central Wetland Area. Such structures to be maintained by a management company. The CHA will NOT maintain these.

A plan showing the proposed street lighting design along the shared footways/cycleways in the wetland has been provided – please refer to Mayer Brown "Proposed Street Lighting Design" drawing ref. PHLITTLE-CWA.10/60.

Final location of lighting columns needs to be 0.5m away from the edge of any path, footway and cycle way/path to be compliant with LTN 1/20. The submitted plans do not show this. Any plans approved must show this.

The applicant notes the CHA comment about the addition of guardrails along the shared use paths. In accordance with the advice contained in LTN 1/20 (5.11 Edge protection), the applicant has identified on a plan locations where they believe protection is required, specifically in proximity of culvert headwalls that would lie in the path of an out-of-control cycle. Please refer to Mayer Brown "Construction Treatments" drawing ref. PHLITTLE-CWA.10/30. They say that the exact form of protection should be agreed with the soft landscape Architect (for example hedges in lieu of parapets / handrails).

As this area is not to be adopted, this is a matter for the LPA to check and ultimately agree using advice in LTN 1/20.

Please note in our view guardrailing along the entire length of the paths would be intrusive and detrimental to the look and feel of the environment and would create an unpleasant feeling of restraint, particularly to cyclists (some pedestrians may also climb over it, which creates a further safety risk).

2. The structures – As for the road, it is unclear as to the extent of the scheme which the CHA is being asked to consider. The plans imply just the crossing under the northern section of the spine road as referred to in point 1 above. However, the description in the planning application and extent of red edging appears to cover all of the central wetlands area.

The extent of the central wetland area is identified by a redline boundary on the provided Mayer Brown sketch drawing "Central Wetland Location Plan" ref. MBSK211021-1.

From consideration of the plans on the ADC Planning portal, WSCC structures comments are as follows:

1. The planning portal shows plan drg. 35944/1507/003 rev P04 (for the BEBO arch). This is the same drawing WSCC have in the AIP that has been approved.
2. There's a drg. for the piles and piles caps (drg. 2231-001 & 002) that WSCC hasn't seen previously but wouldn't expect to see until the awaited Design and Check submission (which will also require approval) prior to construction.
3. Similarly, there are some BEBO installation and technical drawings (refs docs ending ...E15.5MT/004 & 002), that WSCC hasn't seen before as part of a TA submission. Again, the final technical issues would need to be considered through the Design and Check process (which will also require approval) prior to construction.
4. The structures engineer has found a couple of pipes under the road (ref the 1st set of 'drainage plans and appendices') but these are below the WSCC 900mm diameter threshold for interest. However, these might be checked again at detailed design stage.
5. On the second set of 'drainage plans and appendices', on the first page it shows 3No. culverts all of which are 2m span but only 1.0m high. These are below the 1.2m minimum headroom defined in CD 529. Applicant to note that a headroom above the minimum is expected.
6. Following on from the above, the TA process for the BEBO arch appears to be well underway, but the same TA process for the 3No. culverts will need to be followed. As always, early engagement from the applicant's designer with both the LPA and WSCC is recommended.

Applicant to respond to all the above.

The applicant has noted the previous WSCC CHA comments about the minimum 1.2m headroom for culverts defined in CD 529. They have stated that the shared use paths and culverts in the wetland will not be offered for adoption. They also state that the footpath levels are such that the minimum headroom requirement cannot be achieved for the culverts. These are also less than 12m in length, and therefore the designer considers that the 1.2m minimum headroom should not be required for these structures. They reference Mayer Brown "Proposed Levels and Drainage" drawing ref. PHLITTLE-CWA.10/20. for more details.

The applicant also notes the CHA comments with regard to the technical approval process for the BEBO arch and the culverts. Please refer to point 2.5 above regarding the 3 No. culverts.

From the CHA's perspective (and even if the structures are not being offered for adoption), WSCC would still require oversight of the design for due diligence purposes. Post-planning, the applicant would need to provide details of each of the proposed structures so that WSCC can have an overview and store records of the private

structures accordingly. The design submission will need to provide a sound technical reasoning for any lower than desirable headroom proposed.

For information, WSCC is assuming that all of the structures are CAT 0 wherein a Design and Check certificate (in accordance with CG 300, Appendix I) and accompanying drawings will be required.

Conclusion.

Further information is required. Please see **highlighted/bold blue** text above. When received the CHA will consider the proposal further. Please re-consult when available.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services