

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Simon Davis
FROM:	WSCC – Highways Authority
DATE:	4 December 2024
LOCATION:	Land west of Pagham Road Pagham
SUBJECT:	P/114/24/RES Reserved matters application (pursuant to outline permission P/178/21/OUT (APP/C3810/W/22/3302023)) for matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale concerning the construction of 95 new homes along with new pedestrian and cycle links, open space, landscaping, habitat creation, drainage features and associated groundworks and infrastructure. This development is in CIL zone 5 (CIL liable as new dwellings) and may affect the setting of listed buildings.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

1. Comments are made in respects of,
 - Site Layout, drawing number SL01, revision A
 - Road Widths Around Site, drawing number MBSK241016-02, revision P3
 - Colour Landscape Masterplan, drawing number D3322-FAB-00-XX-DR-L-5000, revision PL02
 - Swept Path Analysis Refuse Vehicle Around Site, drawing number MBSK241016-TK01, revision P3
2. For the purposes of these comments, WSCC Highways are commenting on the general acceptability of the proposals in planning terms. Where appropriate, WSCC may also comment on the acceptability in terms of highway adoption although it is recognised that this is not a material planning consideration. The Applicant should note that an aspect may be acceptable in planning terms but may not be acceptable for adoption through any subsequent agreement under the 1980 Highways Act.
3. The arrangement comprises predominantly of 5.5 metre wide carriageways and 2 metre wide footways segregated by way of a full height kerbs. There is one short length of shared surface highway along the main access road where pedestrians and vehicles share the same space. There are also areas of shared use within the no through roads that serve a small number of dwellings and associated car parking spaces.

Whilst WSCC have no particular concerns with the general principles shown, the inclusion of the short length of shared surface on the main access road does seem at odds with the remainder of the development with it unclear why pedestrians elsewhere are provided with a footway but this is deemed unnecessary in this situation. For partially sighted pedestrians, the arrangement shown is not especially logical. WSCC preference would be to continue the footway across the frontages of plots 70 to 75.

4. It would also be highlighted that shared surface areas should be built in a contrasting material to areas of segregated footway and carriageways. There is contradicting information in these respects shown on the 'Colour Landscape Masterplan' and the 'Site Layout'; one drawing shows the use of a contrasting material whereas the other shows surfacing comparable to the standard segregated footway/carriageway construction. The drawings should be consistent.
5. The road narrowing in front of plots 71 and 72 would serve no additional purpose beyond that already achieved through the existing road layout. The narrowing would only otherwise restrict access to the driveway for plot 71. It's recommended that the narrowing is removed.
6. The exact nature of the area proposed on the opposite side of the access to plots 39 and 40 is unclear. The 'Colour Landscape Masterplan' shows this area in a different material with what appears to be a bench and fencing alongside the carriageway edge. WSCC preference would be for this area to be of typical footway construction as found elsewhere within the development. The features shown within this area can then be positioned outside of any highway areas. WSCC would flag this as the introduction of non-standard features may complicate the adoption process.
7. WSCC would also strongly recommend that the fencing shown on the 'Colour Landscape Masterplan' that extends all the around the perimeter of the landscaped area is setback and positioned a minimum of 450 mm back from the carriageway edge. This will then avoid the fencing being struck by vehicles. Also any gates within the fencing should provide a waiting areas for pedestrians to stand clear of the live carriageway whilst opening the gates.
8. The visitor parking bays opposite plots 69 and 88 should be 6 metres long. The lengths as presented are substandard meaning these bays will be unusable by the majority of vehicles.

9. A detailed breakdown will be required to show the parking provision complies with the adopted Arun District Council parking standards. As an observation, there doesn't appear to be any great number of visitor parking spaces. Visitor parking bays should be designed to be accessible by disabled persons (i.e. be of suitable width and have a hard margin rather than vehicle occupants exiting onto grass).
10. As a general comment, the highway alignment to the north of plot 75 is quite severe and not ideal. Intervisibility between two opposing vehicles would be quite limited. Vehicles passing through this bend would not in practice be tight to the kerb but likely taking a more central position in the carriageway. Vehicle speeds would be low passing through this but it would be desirable for the alignment to be altered.
11. Pedestrian crossing points with tactile paving should be provided at all junctions and potential crossing locations.
12. Clarification would be sought from the Applicant on the above points.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services

Davina Bowley

From: Nicola Oktay on behalf of Planning.Responses
Sent: 17 December 2024 10:07
To: Planning Scanning
Subject: FW: Response To Application Number P/114/24/RES at Land west of Pagham Road Pagham
Attachments: Response_P-114-24-1.pdf

WSCC Highways response

Nikki Oktay
Planning Receptionist, Planning Department

T: 01903 737965
E: Nicola.Oktay@arun.gov.uk

Arun District Council, Civic Centre, Maltravers Rd
Littlehampton, West Sussex, BN17 5LF
www.arun.gov.uk

To register to receive notifications of planning applications in your area please go to <https://www1.arun.gov.uk/planning-application-finder>



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]

To: Planning.Responses <Planning.Responses@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Response To Application Number P/114/24/RES at Land west of Pagham Road Pagham

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Please could the attached response be distributed to the relevant case officer.

Regards

Ian Gledhill

Please do not reply directly to this email.

Any formal reconsultation on the application should be directed to SULocalDevelopment@westsussex.gov.uk but the responding officer can be contacted directly via email if there are any questions relating to this response.

LEGAL DISCLAIMER

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended solely for the persons addressed. If it has come to you in error please reply to advise us but you should not read it, copy it, show it to anyone else nor make any other use of its content. West Sussex County Council takes steps to ensure emails and attachments are virus-free but you should carry out your own checks before opening any attachment.