

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Katie Sharp
FROM:	WSCC - Highway Authority
DATE:	8th September 2022
LOCATION:	Land north of Toddington Lane (adjacent to Lyminster Bypass) Hampton Park Littlehampton BN17 7PP
SUBJECT:	LU/417/21/OUT Outline application with some matters reserved (except access) for the erection of up to 71 No dwellings. Further information received in Katie Sharp's email of 26th August 2022.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a (desktop study)
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a TBA

This is the second WSCC County Highways (CHA) response to the above outline planning application with some matters reserved (except access) for the erection of up to 71 dwellings. Comments below respond to additional information received from the case officer dated 26th August 2022 and should be read alongside previous CHA response dated 16th February 2022.

Response.

In its previous response dated 16th February 2022, the CHA requested that additional information be provided in order to be able to consider the proposal further. The details of this can be found in the main text of the previous response but are summarised below:

1. Provision of plans showing improved pedestrian and cycle access design at the vehicular access points
2. Provision of a plan showing additional foot and cycle connections to and from the adjacent walking and cycle paths
3. A Stage 1 road safety audit of all that referred to in points 1 and 2 above (including road safety audit log listing the designer's responses to any recommendations made)
4. Plan showing removal of the informal path running across the northern part of the northern plot and out to the WSCC section of the Lyminster By-Pass
5. Provision of a suitable financial contribution to public transport (bus) access to the site
6. Provision of an updated Travel Plan
7. Comments in response to design of parking provision
8. Comments in response to comments made about EV installation

Comments below in *red italic* text are latest CHA responses to points 1-8 above following consideration of latest information:

1. Provision of plans showing improved pedestrian and cycle access design at the vehicular access points. *This is now shown on Drawing No. 21023-HNW-ZZ-00-DR-A-2001 Revision P03. However, at the detailed design stage, the road markings delineating the start/finish of the cycle path on the carriageway should either be fully on the public highway **or** fully within the development on the private internal carriageway and not part on one and part on the other. This will require a minor amendment to both access points at the detailed design stage. This is to ensure that future maintenance of the lines will be achieved consistently across both access points.*
2. Provision of a plan showing additional foot and cycle connections to and from the adjacent walking and cycle paths. *This is now shown indicatively on Drawing No. 21023-HNW-ZZ-00-DR-A-2001 Revision P03. However, at the detailed design stage, the road markings delineating the start/finish of the cycle path on the carriageway should either be fully on the public highway **or** fully within the development on the private internal carriageway and not part on one and part on the other. This will require a minor amendment to both access points at the detailed design stage. This is to ensure that future maintenance of the lines will be achieved consistently across both access points. With regard to the paths emerging to the new Southern Relief Road, part of the land in-between the site and road is, to the best of the CHA's knowledge, in the control of Persimmon Homes. Therefore, to achieve these paths would require the permission of the landowner and they would need to be party to any S106 Agreement to secure them. Furthermore, at the detailed design stage, the applicant would need to demonstrate suitable gradients for users.*
3. A Stage 1 road safety audit of all that referred to in points 1 and 2 above (including road safety audit log listing the designer's responses to any recommendations made). *This has now been provided. Five problems have been identified and they are as follows:*

- **PROBLEM 4.2** – Merging traffic passing on offside may collide with a vehicle exiting the southern access. It is proposed to provide a two-lane exit from the roundabout, merging just east of the new southern access. A large vehicle wishing to turn left into the southern access may stop or slow to allow a vehicle exiting the access to pull out first to make their left turn in easier. The audit team is concerned that a merging driver, especially a powered two-wheeler, may overtake and collide with the exiting vehicle.

AUDITOR'S RECOMMENDATION – The central hatching should be adjusted between the splitter island and the southern access to deter overtaking at this location.

DESIGNER'S (DESIGN TEAM) RESPONSE – This element of the scheme has been designed and constructed by others. The recommendation is accepted.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION'S (CHA) RESPONSE – It is not clear what the Design Team intends to do here. Further information required.

PROBLEM 4.3 – Carriageway parking may lead to nose to tail or T-bone collisions. 'Spur Road' and the new accesses do not have any parking restrictions indicated around the junctions. It is also noted that the roundabout design does not provide parking restrictions. This may lead to parking around the junctions and on 'Spur Road', restricting visibility from the accesses and leading to nose to tail or T-bone collisions.

AUDITOR'S RECOMMENDATION – Parking restrictions should be implemented on 'Spur Road'.

DESIGNER'S (DESIGN TEAM) RESPONSE – The recommendation to implement parking restrictions at the junctions onto the spur road is accepted.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION'S (CHA) RESPONSE – Accept audit team recommendation and Design Team's response to it.

- **PROBLEM 4.4** - Restricted visibility may lead to nose to tail and T-bone collisions. Trees or vegetation are indicated within the visibility splay on 'Spur Road' to the east of the new southern access. This may obstruct visibility towards the roundabout for drivers exiting the southern access, leading to nose to tail and T-bone collisions.

AUDITOR'S RECOMMENDATION – The visibility splays should be kept clear of trees and vegetation, or a low-level variety should be used.

DESIGNER'S (DESIGN TEAM) RESPONSE – The recommendation is accepted.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION'S (CHA) RESPONSE – Accept audit team recommendation and Design Team's response to it.

- **PROBLEM 4.5** - Gullies at shared facility tie-ins may lead to cyclists losing control. The tie-in for cyclists between the shared surfaces on 'Spur Road' and the development internal roads is proposed to take the form of advisory cycle lane markings, both of which cross the kerbline at a gully location. Cyclist's wheels crossing a gully may become trapped in the grating and lose control.

AUDITOR'S RECOMMENDATION – The dropped kerb for cyclists to access 'Spur Road' shared facility should avoid the gullies. If this is not possible, cycle-friendly gratings should be installed.

DESIGNER'S (DESIGN TEAM) RESPONSE – The recommendation is accepted. The detail will be established at the detailed design stage.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION'S (CHA) RESPONSE – Accept audit team recommendation and Design Team's response to it.

- **PROBLEM 4.6** - Gullies at shared-surface tie-ins may lead to cyclists losing control. The tie-in for cyclists between the shared surfaces on 'Spur Road' and the development internal roads is proposed to take the form of advisory cycle lane markings. Should two opposing cyclists arrive at the dropped kerb at the same time, this may lead to confusion and cyclists losing control.

AUDITOR'S RECOMMENDATION – Signs and markings for cyclists travelling in both directions should be provided at the tie-in with the shared facility, indicating priority for cyclists joining the shared facility.

DESIGNER'S (DESIGN TEAM) RESPONSE – The recommendation is accepted. The detail will be established at the detailed design stage.

OVERSEEING ORGANISATION'S (CHA) RESPONSE – Accept audit team recommendation and Design Team's response to it.

The locations of the above problems are as shown overleaf:



When replying, the applicant is requested to provide a response in tabular form, including all the responses found above, using the following template (or similar) – to be provided in WORD format to enable the CHA/Overseeing Organisation to add its parts. The Design Organisation should also state the name and position of the Designer and date the document too:

RSA problem	RSA recommendation	Design organisation response	Overseeing Organisation response	Agreed RSA action
<i>Original problem from the RSA report inserted here by the Design Organisation.</i>	<i>Original recommendation from the RSA report inserted here by the Design Organisation.</i>	<i>Design Organisation's Response inserted here.</i>	<i>Overseeing Organisation's response inserted here.</i>	<i><u>Design Organisation's</u> and the Overseeing Organisation's agreed action to the problem inserted here.</i>

- Plan showing removal of the informal path running across the northern part of the northern plot and out to the WSCC section of the Lyminster By-Pass. *Now shown removed. The applicant has also replied saying that the path is solely to be provided within the site and will not have a connection to the adjacent Relief Road.*
- Provision of a suitable financial contribution to public transport (bus) access to the site. *The applicant seems to imply acceptance in principle to providing a contribution. However, the matter is currently being discussed in-house at WSCC Highways to establish the amount. Further comments to follow separately.*

6. Provision of an updated Travel Plan. *This is replied to by the applicant under 'Matters for Planning Conditions'. They say that as this is an outline planning application, the final detail of the Travel Plan can be agreed prior to the site being occupied. However, as there is an expectation by the CHA that the additional measures as set-out in the previous CHA response of 16th February 2022 will be incorporated in any final Plan, the CHA requests that the applicant confirms agreement to that, please. Furthermore, any final plan and associated monitoring fee must be secured by S106 Agreement and not planning condition in order to comply with WSCC Travel Plan Policy.*
7. Comments in response to design of parking provision. *This is replied to by the applicant under 'Matters for Planning Conditions'. The applicant states that as this is an outline proposal, the design of the parking spaces and provision of cycle parking and provision of EV parking can be subject to suitably worded planning conditions. The CHA is agreeable to this.*
8. Comments in response to comments made about EV installation. *Please see comments above under point 7. However, given that Building Regulations changed in June 2022, it may be that EV provision is considered as part of Building Regulations. Planning case officer to advise.*

Other highway-related matters.

Construction of development on land required to enable construction of WSCC-section of Lyminster By-Pass.

Compulsory purchased land for WSCC section of Lyminster By-Pass - T&L Crawley No. 2 LLP (the applicant's for this site) are the landowners of Plots 10a and 10b which are subject to land which WSCC is acquiring temporarily for the construction of the Lyminster Bypass (North) CPO Scheme. Planning Permission for the CPO under reference 'WSCC/049/18/LY' was granted on 9th May 2019.

For the purposes of the WSCC Scheme, Plot 10a is described in the CPO as:

'1081 square metres of commercial development land to the south-east of A284 Lyminster Road from the field boundary in the north, extending south over the North Littlehampton Development land, for temporary use, to provide working space for construction'

Also for purposes of the WSCC Scheme, Plot 10b is described in the CPO as:

'2716 square metres of commercial development land to the south-east of A284 Lyminster Road from the field boundary in the north, extending south over the North Littlehampton Development land, for temporary use, for creation of compound area during construction of new carriageway and working space for the construction of an embankment'

The CPO was confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport on 16th September 2021 and following the service of Notices to Treat and Enter, WSCC and/or its appointed operatives, are able to gain entry onto the site to begin construction of the Bypass on 22nd February 2022.

The Planning Permission and the confirmed CPO allows WSCC and/or its appointed operatives, unfettered access to the land (plots 10a and 10b) to construct the By-Pass and for additional compound storage until the By-Pass is open for public use. T&L Crawley will not be able to interfere with the construction or have control of the land until the land is returned to them after the By-Pass is open for public use and is adopted highway maintained at the public's expense.

WSCC ask that Arun District Council are mindful of this when they are considering the landowner's recent application to change the existing planning permission from commercial development to residential development.

The CPO Scheme is contained within the 'red line' boundary as attached to the Committee Report (pages 35, 37 and 39) that accompanies that application. However, the areas outside the red line boundary may also be affected by the construction of the By-Pass and WSCC ask that Arun District Council also consider this when reviewing LU/417/21.

Internal access/road layout.

As submitted, the internal road/access layouts for both the northern and southern plots (north and south of 'Spur Road' respectively), are not suitable for adoption under section 38 of the Highways Act 1980, given lack of service margins and location and design of some of the parking spaces.

Conclusion.

Additional information is required by the CHA in order to be able to consider the proposal further. The details of this can be found in the main text of this response but are summarised below:

1. A Road Safety Audit Decision Log (in tabular form) and with a further response to RSA Problem 4.2.
2. Provision of agreement to including the Travel Plan measures as previously put forward by the CHA.

Please re-consult when this information is available.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services