

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

DATE: 10th April 2014

**FROM: Ian Gledhill TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Neil Crowther**

**SUBJECT: LU/44/14 - Approval of Reserved Matters following outline approval
LU/355/10 for phase 2, 185 units for layout, appearance scale and landscape of dwellings.
Departure from the Development Plan.**

Land South of Courtwick Park, Courtwick Lane, Littlehampton, West Sussex

RECOMMENDATION:

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

It's noted that the site benefits from an outline planning permission through which only means of access was approved. Certain concepts for the design of the on-site carriageways were detailed as part of the outline permission. The layout submitted has been considered against these design principles and current highway design guidance set out within Manual for Streets (MfS).

The following comments are made in respects of drawing number P802/BEL/PH3&4/01.

- It is unclear of the extents of the internal roads that are to be offered for adoption as public highway. It would be beneficial if the applicant could confirm their intentions.
- Carriageway widths along through routes are generally 5.5 metres wide with 2 metre footways. Parking along these routes is in defined parking bays along the carriageway edge. Initially 5.5 metre then narrowing to 4.1 metre wide shared surfaces are shown for the majority of cul-de-sacs. 1 metre service margins are shown on both sides of the shared surfaces, although there are locations where planting is shown within this. In the event that these are offered for adoption, it is likely that the Local Highway Authority would require these to be kept clear. Notwithstanding the matter of planting in service margins, these arrangements are acceptable and comply with the design principles set out within LU/355/10 as well as within Manual for Streets.
- Raised shared surface areas are proposed at all notable junctions within the site. Similar arrangements have already been accepted as part of other approved phases. The inclusion of such arrangements ensures continuity through the development for pedestrians and drivers. How these are defined, especially in terms of routes for partially sighted pedestrians and connections into standard footway construction, would need to be considered through the detailed design.
- As a specific comment, the shared surface area to the south of plot 199 is quite expansive to the point where parking could occur on the shared surface on the northbound approaches to the junction. Any parking would interfere with pedestrian routes, which themselves are lengthy across the shared surface. Whilst it is understood that this junction forms part of the bus route, it is recommended that the extents of shared surface on the northbound approach to the junction are reduced. This seems entirely feasible without affecting the operation of the junction.

- Defined parking lay-bys and planting encroach into the visibility splays at the majority, if not all, junctions. MfS advises that ideally defined parking bays should be provided outside the visibility splay. MfS recognises that in some circumstances, where speeds are low, some encroachment may be acceptable. The LHA would accept some encroachment into the visibility splays, however the applicant should define the visibility splays based on the design speed applied and identify how this parking influences visibility at the junctions.
- Planting is shown within verges alongside the highway. In the event that the roads, footways and verges are offered for adoption, the future maintenance of planting within the highway would need to be agreed as part of the Section 38 agreement. As part of the detailed design, the planting in some locations may need to be reconsidered to accommodate street lighting.
- Notwithstanding the comments about parking within the visibility splays, parking is provided across the site predominantly within on-curtilage spaces, small parking courts, as well as within defined on-street parking bays. Visitor parking spaces are distributed across the development. There are no concerns with the way in which parking is provided. It's unclear how the total parking provision has been arrived at. No references are made within the Design and Access Statement to the evidence used to forecast demands. It is strongly recommended that the applicant considers parking provision against the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator. This uses car ownership data from existing dwellings in the locality of the development to forecast potential parking demands.
- The development will also provide access to Brook Barn Farm located to the north. It's unclear if this forms part of the current application or LU/43/11. In any case the access arrangements from and through the development should take into account the potential movements of farm traffic. The applicant should confirm if the layout has taken these into account as agricultural vehicles are more onerous than typical vehicles associated with residential units.
- Similar to the above point, whilst a private road, there is an existing through route to Brook Barn Farm via Courtwick Park Cottages. The DAS submitted with LU/355/10 indicates that this access is to be maintained. The drawing however shows no dropped kerb/bellmouth onto the proposed access road. This should be checked and the drawing amended if appropriate.

Whilst there are no over-riding in principle issues, the applicant should address the above matters.

Ian Gledhill
Strategic Planning