

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

DATE: 7th April 2014

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

**SUBJECT: LU/51/14 - Outline application for approval of access arrangements to serve
68 No residential units.**

**Land South of Littlehampton Academy, Elm Grove Road, Littlehampton, West
Sussex, BN17 6FE**

RECOMMENDATION:

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

The application seeks outline planning permission with only access to be approved at this stage. Various details have been provided stating the dwellings mix and number of parking spaces, as well as a block plan showing the internal arrangements. Whilst comments are made on these indicative details, it is understood that these matters may change as part of any subsequent reserved matters application.

The current application is supported by way of a transport statement and stage one road safety audit. These have been considered by the Local Highway Authority. The LHA has provided advice at the pre application stage.

Trip generation

Trip generation has been forecast using TRICS. This is a database of traffic surveys that can be refined using various parameters so as to best reflect the proposed the development in terms of its location and nature. The use of TRICS in principle is an acceptable technique providing appropriate selection parameters are used.

The proposed development comprises a mix of affordable and private dwellings. Separate trip rates have been defined for the affordable and private dwellings. As noted above, planning approval is sought at this stage for a development of 68 dwellings and access only. The indicative housing figures provided on the application form, particularly for the private dwellings, indicates a very small number of flats. The TRICS outputs for the private dwellings however incorporate a number of existing developments that include flats. Trip rates for flats are recognised as being lower than houses. The inclusion of a number of mixed housing developments with flats may not therefore be entirely representative of the proposed development. As such the trip rate suggested for the private dwellings is potentially too low and unrepresentative of the indicative details included. For both the private and affordable dwellings, the 'location' parameter includes locations that according to the TRICS Good Practice Guidance that may not be compatible.

At this stage, the trip rates cannot be agreed and for clarity this work should be redone. The trip generation will influence the outcomes of the capacity assessments. However, those junctions that have been assessed are indicated to be working well within their theoretical capacities, with limited queuing and delays forecast. As such, whilst the trip generation has not been agreed, in principle this development is very unlikely to result in any detriment to highway capacity upon which an objection could be based. Even so, if the revised trip generation is significantly different, the applicant would be required to undertake further capacity assessments.

Access Arrangements

Two vehicular access points are proposed. A new access is proposed onto the southern section of the recently constructed Fitzalan Link Road (FLR). This access would serve 55 units. The existing vehicular access onto Elm Grove Road, previously used by traffic associated with Elm Grove School, is being realigned and retained to serve 13 units.

The FLR presently is a no through road serving only the Littlehampton Academy. Planning permission (LU/63/11) has been granted to extend the FLR northwards to join the A259. The FLR along with the future Lyminster by-pass is intended to provide a new strategic route from Littlehampton to the A27 to the north. There are no known policy reasons that would prevent or restrict new accesses from being constructed onto the FLR. As such the access has been considered against current design guidance to ensure the construction and use of this does not result in any highway capacity or safety issues.

The basic design principles of the FLR extension have been agreed as part of LU/63/11. The FLR is to have a 30mph speed limit and is intended to be a tree lined boulevard with an unsegregated foot/cycle way along the western side. As part of the through road arrangement a new roundabout will be constructed to serve Littlehampton Academy. The access proposed as part of the current application would be sited to the south of this roundabout.

The new access onto the FLR is to take the form of a priority junction with a 5.5 metres wide carriageway with 6 metre kerb radii. Whilst the trip generation has not been agreed, the principle of a priority junction would be acceptable; there is no expectation that the 55 units would generate more than 500 movements per day (as set out within TD 42/95 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) to require consideration of a right turning lane.

In light of the intention to extend the FLR northwards, two access drawings have been submitted. These show the development access with the FLR as is and extended northwards. The design principles applied to the design of the FLR have been used to determine the arrangements for the new access. Given the 30mph design speed, the principles of Manual for Streets are applicable. Visibility splays of 2.4 metres by 43 metres are shown. The LHA as part of the FLR planning application did raise concerns relating to the potential for inappropriate vehicle speeds along the FLR because of the proposed alignment. The 43 metre sightline from the access to the north is drawn to the Littlehampton Academy arm of the roundabout. A vehicle waiting to emerge from the development would however have a clear sightline beyond the proposed roundabout of southbound traffic. Evidently from the drawings significantly greater visibility splays are achievable.

The drawings demonstrate that the development can be constructed regardless of whether the FLR is extended or not and to ensure the access does not fetter the FLR. From these drawings it is evident that alterations would be required to the development access' northern kerbline to tie in with the extended FLR. These changes are only minor and would be entirely within what will be public highway. As there is no certainty as to when the FLR or the development would be built, it is recommended that the access arrangement is secured by condition, requiring plans and details to be submitted. The respective access arrangement would then need to be submitted to discharge the condition depending upon the situation with the FLR at the time the development comes forward.

In both situations, the existing TOUCAN crossing to the south of the development access will remain. The guidance within LTN 2/95 (Design of Signalised Pedestrian Crossings) requires a minimum 20metre distance from the position of the emerging vehicle to the crossing. The drawings submitted indicate a distance of 30metres is achievable. The access would not affect the operation of the crossing point.

The access from Elm Grove Road is in essence existing but proposed to be realigned slightly. This access was used in conjunction with the former Elm Grove School. The proposed

dwelling would give rise to a very low level of movements compared with the former situation. The width of Elm Grove Road is clearly affected by the presence of vehicles parked on the carriageway, requiring opposing vehicles to give way. Notwithstanding the former use, the proposed dwellings have the potential to increase the number of opposing vehicles. Whilst this may give rise to minor delays, it would not constitute a highway safety issue.

Both access arrangements onto Elm Grove Road and the Fitzalan Link Road (which includes the two options) have been the subject of a Stage One Road Safety Audit. The Auditor has raised one problem regarding the acuteness of the angle at which the existing cycle path meets Elm Grove Road as a consequence of the proposed realigned access road. The arrangement has been revised to reduce the angle. The proposed arrangement is not now greatly different from the existing situation. These works can be secured via condition.

Just as a general note, there are references within the TS to the use of Transport for London standards for cycle design. Whilst the TfL standards could be used to inform the design, these are not national or local design standards recognised within West Sussex. As part of the detailed design references should be made to national standards where appropriate.

The proposed vehicular access arrangements are considered acceptable.

Accessibility

The TS identifies that the development is within reasonable walking and cycling distances of a range of facilities as defined within the CIHT 'Providing for Journeys on Foot' and LTN 1/08 documents. There are continuous walking routes into Littlehampton town centre. The development also lies adjacent to a signed cycle route that also leads into the town centre. The continuation of the FLR northwards would also provide a further route onto the cycle route along the A259.

A Travel Plan has also been provided. Typically for a development of this size, a TP Statement is required as opposed to a full TP.

The NPPF requires that plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure. Whilst the private car may need to be used for some trip purposes, the location of the development promotes and enables residents to travel by a range of different modes. Future residents would not be reliant upon the use of the private car.

Layout

As stated above, it is noted that the current application seeks outline permission with only access to be approved at this stage. Even so indicative details have been provided of the layout and parking provision. Comments are offered on these, however these arrangements would be considered through the reserved matters application.

- The layout includes mainly segregated 5.5 metre carriageways and 1.8 metre footways. However there is short section of shared surface. This short section seems unnecessary and would lead to potential difficulties in terms of continuity for partially sighted pedestrians. Whilst there are no issues with shared surfaces being used in a development of this nature, these would need to be better considered.
- Elements of the carriageways are quite angular and the alignment would be potentially difficult to negotiate if on-street parking occurs. The swept paths provided for a refuse vehicle clearly show that the alignment in places does not work as kerbs and footways are being over-run and the manoeuvring being quite difficult.
- Parking provision has been based upon the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator. As the mix of dwellings is not being finalised at this stage, this may be subject to change. The

parking provision and total number of spaces should be agreed through the reserved matters application.

- The layout of parking spaces is provided in a mix of on-curtilage, parking courts and parking laybys. There are a number of comments relating to the layout,
 - On-street visitor parking does need to be better distributed throughout the development. The swept path for a refuse vehicle clearly indicates that any on-street parking would result in difficulties for manoeuvring.
 - It's unclear how the spaces to the front of plots 56-61 are accessed (are they accessed individually from the main access road or via the paved square?). If they are served from the access road, at this stage there would be potential issues raised with vehicles reversing in the vicinity of the main access into the development.
 - The parking court for the Elm Grove Road accessed element of the development is detached from those dwellings closest to Elm Grove Road. Residents would choose to park as close to their dwellings front entrances as possible. The parking arrangements should therefore be reconsidered.
 - All of the parallel parking bays would require 45 degree splays on both ends.

Other Matters

Suitable controls and restrictions relating to construction would need to be secured via condition. In particular routing for construction traffic should be controlled to minimise the impact upon Elm Grove Road, which is narrow and unsuitable for construction traffic. It would seem feasible for all construction traffic to be routed onto the Fitzalan Link Road. Whilst there are significant pedestrian flows resulting from the Academy at certain times, appropriate controls can be put in place to mitigate any potential risk.

Conclusion

Before conditions are recommended, the trip generation and potential capacity matters do need to be resolved.

Ian Gledhill
Strategic Planning

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DIVISION: SECTION 106 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**DATE: 2nd April 2014****FROM: Adam Charlton, Monitoring and Records****TO: Ian Gledhill, Planning Applications Team****DISTRICT/BOROUGH COUNCIL: Arun****Application Number: LU/51/14****The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to Development at Land South of Littlehampton Academy, Elm Grove Road, Littlehampton, West Sussex****Planning Application details - Outline application for approval of access arrangements to serve 68 No residential units.**

Education			
Locality	Littlehampton		
Population Adjustment	115.0		
	Primary	Secondary	6th Form
Child Product	1.5632	1.5632	0.8441
Total Places Required	10.9424	7.8160	1.6883
Library			
Locality	Littlehampton		
Contribution towards Angmering / Arundel / East Preston / Ferring / Findon Valley	£0		
Contribution towards Rustington / Willowhale	£0		
Contribution towards Bognor Regis / Littlehampton	£13,559		
Population Adjustment	115.0		
Sqm per population	35		
Sqm Required	0.00		
Waste			
Adjusted Net. Households	55		
Fire			
No. Hydrants	TBC		
Population Adjustment	115.0		
£/head of additional population	£13		
TAD- Transport			
Net Population Increase	0.0		
Net Parking Spaces	0		
Net Commercial Floor Space sqm	0		
Total Access (commercial only)	0.0000		

Summary of Contributions

S106 type	Monies Due
Education - Primary	£146,803
Education - Secondary	£158,000
Education - 6th Form	£37,013
Libraries	£13,559
Waste	No contribution required
Fire & Rescue	£1,495
No. of Hydrants	TBC
TAD	No contribution required

Total Contribution	£356,871
---------------------------	-----------------

Note: The above summary does not include the installation costs of fire hydrants. Where these are required on developments, (quantity as identified above) as required under the Fire Services Act 2004 they will be installed as a

planning obligation and at direct cost to the developer. (Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act). Hydrants should be attached to a mains capable of delivering sufficient flow and pressure for fire fighting as required in the National Guidance Document on the Provision of Water for Fire Fighting 3rd Edition (Appendix 5)

The above contributions are required pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 to mitigate the impacts of the subject proposal with the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

Planning obligations requiring the above money is understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined by the in the *National Planning Policy Framework, 2012*.

The basis for this advice is contained in the County Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document "The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1".

All TAD (Total Access Demand) contributions have been calculated in accordance with the stipulated local threshold and the methodology adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in November 2003.

The calculations have been derived on the basis of an increase in 68 Net dwellings.

Further to the monetary contributions The County Fire Officer advises that the proposed development may need to include the provision of fire hydrants connected to adequate supplies of water for fire fighting (Contact: David Boarer – Fire Services 01243 813667). It should also include suitable access for fire brigade vehicles and equipment.

Please see below for a Breakdown and explanation of the WSCC Contribution Calculators. Also see the attached spreadsheet for the breakdown of the calculation figures. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (<http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106>).

Deed of Planning Obligations

- a) As a deed of planning obligations would be required to ensure payment of the necessary financial contribution, the County Council would require the proposed development to reimburse its reasonable legal fees incurred in the preparation of the deed.
- b) The deed would provide for payment of the financial contribution upon commencement of the development.
- c) In order to reflect the changing costs, the deed would include arrangements for review of the financial contributions at the date the payment is made if the relevant date falls after 31st March 2014.
- d) Review of the contributions towards school building costs should be by reference to the DfF adopted Primary/Secondary/Further Secondary school building costs applicable at the date of payment of the contribution and where this has not been published in the financial year in which the contribution has been made then the contribution should be index linked to the DfE cost multiplier and relevant increase in the RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.
- e) Review of the contribution towards the provision of additional library floorspace should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.
- f) Review of the contribution towards the provision of fire service infrastructure (fire stations) should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Recent experience suggests that where a change in contributions required in relation to a development or the necessity for indexation of financial contributions from the proposed development towards the costs of providing service infrastructure such as libraries is not specifically set out within recommendations approved by committee, applicants are unlikely to agree to such provisions being included in the deed itself. Therefore, it is important that your report and recommendations should cover a possible change in requirements and the need for appropriate indexation arrangements in relation to financial contributions.

Please ensure that applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and thus require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the housing mix is known and not be left until signing of the section 106 Agreement is imminent.

Where the developer intends to keep some of the estate roads private we will require provisions in any s106 agreement to ensure that they are properly built, never offered for adoption and that a certificate from a suitably qualified professional is provided confirming their construction standard.

Where land is to be transferred to or from the County Council as part of the development (e.g. a school site) that we will require the developer to provide CAD drawings of the site to aid design/layout and to ensure that there is no accidental encroachment by either the developer or WSCC.

It should be noted that the figures quoted in this letter are based on current information and will be adhered to for 3 months. Thereafter, if they are not consolidated in a signed S106 agreement they will be subject to revision as necessary to reflect the latest information as to cost and need.

Please see below for a Breakdown of the Contribution Calculators for clarification of West Sussex County Council's methodology in calculating Contributions. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (<http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106>).

Breakdown of Contribution Calculation Formulas:

1. School Infrastructure Contributions

The financial contributions for school infrastructure are broken up into three categories (primary, secondary, sixth form). Depending on the existing local infrastructure only some or none of these categories of education will be required. Where the contributions are required the calculations are based on the additional amount of children and thus school places that the development would generate (shown as **TPR- Total Places Required**). The TPR is then multiplied by the Department for Children, Schools and Families school building costs per pupil place (**cost multiplier**).

School Contributions = TPR x cost multiplier

a) TPR- Total Places Required:

TPR is determined by the number of year groups in each school category multiplied by the child product.

TPR = (No of year groups) x (child product)

Year groups are as below:

- Primary school- **7** year groups (aged 4 to 11)
- Secondary School- **5** year groups (aged 11 to 16)
- Sixth Form School Places- **2** year groups (aged 16 to 18)

Child Product is the **adjusted education population** multiplied by average amount of children, taken to be 14 children per year of age per 1000 persons (average figure taken from 2001 Census).

Child Product = Adjusted Population x 14 / 1000

Note: The adjusted education population for the child product excludes population generated from 1 bed units, Sheltered and 55+ Age Restricted Housing and Social Rented Housing as a nil child product is assumed for these dwellings.

b) Cost multiplier- Education Services

The cost multiplier is a figure released by the Department for Education. It is a school building costs per pupil place as at 2013/2014, updated by Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors Building Cost Information Service All-In Tender Price Index. Each Cost multiplier is as below:

- Primary Schools- **£13,416 per child**
- Secondary Schools- **£20,215 per child**
- Sixth Form Schools- **£21,924 per child**

2. Library Infrastructure

There are two methodologies used for calculating library infrastructure Contributions. These have been locally tailored on the basis of required contributions and the nature of the library in the locality, as below:

Library infrastructure contributions are determined by the population adjustment resulting in a square metre demand for library services. The square metre demand is multiplied by a cost multiplier which determines the total contributions as below:

Contributions = SQ M Demand x Cost Multiplier

a) Square Metre Demand

The square metre demand for library floor space varies across the relevant districts and parishes on the basis of library infrastructure available and the settlement population in each particular locality. The **local floorspace demand (LFD)** figure varies between 30 and 35 square metres per 1000 people and is provided with each individual calculation.

Square Metre Demand = (Adjusted Population x LFD) / 1000

b) Cost Multiplier- Library Infrastructure

WSCC estimated cost of providing relatively small additions to the floorspace of existing library buildings is **£3,930** per square metre. This figure was updated by WSCC's Quantity surveyor for the 2013/2014 period.

3. Fire & Rescue Service Infrastructure

The Fire and Rescue Services infrastructure contribution is determined by the population adjustment multiplied by the relevant cost multiplier for the provision of services.

Fire and Rescue Contributions = Adjusted Population x Cost Multiplier

a) Adjusted Population

This is the sum of the occupancy rates for the net dwelling increase with the exclusion of social housing increase.

b) Cost Multiplier- Fire Rescue

There are two cost multipliers for WSCC which relate to the Southern Division and the Northern Division. The cost multiplier is calculated by dividing the total cost of necessary fire and rescue infrastructure within the division by the projected population for 2016. The cost multipliers are as below:

Southern Division (Chichester, Arun, Worthing and Adur): £13 per person

Northern Division (Horsham, Crawley, Mid Sussex): £50 per person in Horsham, £92 per person in Crawley

Note: The installation costs of fire hydrants are excluded from the above and will continue to be required on developments as a direct cost to the developer as required under the Fire Services Act 2004

4. TAD- Total Access Demand

The methodology is based on total access to and from a development. An **Infrastructure Contribution** is required in respect of each occupant or employee provided with a parking space, as they would be more likely to use the road infrastructure. The **Sustainable Transport Contribution** is required in respect of each occupant or employee not provided with a parking space which would be likely to rely on sustainable transport.

TAD = Infrastructure contribution + Sustainable Transport contribution

a) Infrastructure Contribution

Contributions for Infrastructure are determined by the net increase in car parking spaces, multiplied by WSCC's estimated cost of providing transport infrastructure per vehicle-Infrastructure cost multiplier. The Infrastructure cost multiplier as at 2012/2013 is £1,000 per parking space.

Infrastructure contributions = Car parking spaces x Cost multiplier.

b) Sustainable Transport Contribution

This is derived from the net car parking increase subtracted from the projected increase in occupancy of the development. The sustainable transport contribution increases where the population is greater than the parking provided. The sustainable transport figure is then multiplied by County Council's estimated costs of providing sustainable transport infrastructure cost multiplier (£500).

Sustainable transport contr. = (net car parking – occupancy) x 500

Note: occupancy is determined by projected rates per dwelling and projected people per commercial floorspace as determined by WSCC.

cc: **David Boarer, WSCC Fire Services (via email)**
Deborah Lewis, WSCC Library Services (via email)
Tracey Dunn, WSCC Children and Young People's Services (via email)