

10461 Hook Lane, Pagham

Technical Note 5 Rv1: Response to WSCC Highways Comments on RMA 24th May 2021

1 Introduction

Purpose of this Note

- 1.1 Brookbanks is appointed by Hallam Land Management Ltd to provide engineering consultancy services for a proposed residential and mixed-use development at Land at Hook Lane, Pagham.
- 1.2 This note seeks to provide a response (in red) and address the comments made by West Sussex County Council acting in their role as the Highway Authority following a reserved matters application for the overall site layout.

2 Response to WSCC Highways Comments

WSCC Comments and Brookbanks Response

- 2.1 Comments are made against,
 - Refused Vehicle Tracking Sheets 1, 2 and 3 (drawing numbers 10461-VT-01 Rev D, 10461-VT-02 Rev C, 10461-VT-03 Rev C)
 - Reserved Matters Hardworks Plans (drawing numbers 167-RM-01/02/03/04/05/06/06 all Revision A)
 - Road Layout and Visibility Sheets 1, 2 and 3 (drawing number 10461-HL-01/02/03 Revisions A)
 - Site Layout Northern (drawing number SL.01-N Revision A)
 - Site Layout Southern (drawing number SL.02-S Revision A)
- 2.1.1 **Noted**
- 2.2 WSCC Highways are commenting on the planning merits of the details proposed. The comments made here do not seek to approve any aspect of the layout that may be covered by a highway adoption agreement made under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. This includes matters relating to surfacing, street lighting, drainage, signing, lining, and any street furniture within adoptable areas. This list is not inclusive of all potential aspects.
- 2.2.1 **Noted**
- 2.3 Road widths are indicated on the Road Layout Drawings (sheets 1 to 3). The widths and geometry shown on these drawings comply with current guidance within Manual for Streets.
- 2.3.1 **Noted**

- 2.4** There are a number of comments regarding detailed aspects of the layout,
- 2.4.1** **Noted**
- 2.5** The parking layby opposite plots 234-235 is unusual given it creates an isolated carriageway narrowing with no other comparable features anywhere else within the development. The layby should be inset into the foot/cycleway, the need for which is question in point 16 below.
- 2.5.1** **We understand that this feature follows the original intent as per the Design Code.**
- 2.6** The 5 metre road width indicated outside plot 5 is acknowledged as being wide enough to enable two opposing vehicles to pass. However the carriageway immediately before and after is 6 or 6.1 metres wide. It's consequently unclear why the carriageway narrows by a metre in this location. There is seemingly room to achieve a consistent carriageway width along this section of access road.
- 2.6.1** **Road widths along the spine road have been adjusted accordingly.**
- 2.7** Visibility splays suitable for a 20mph design speed are indicated at all junctions throughout the site, although the speed limit will be 30mph given the roads will be street lit unless a 20mph speed limit is to be applied for. The layout of the main access road running through the site is such that this is unlikely to constrain actual vehicle speeds to 20mph or less. Greater visibility splays would seem achievable at most junctions but this would need to be checked.
- 2.7.1** **Visibility splays have been adjusted to suit a 30mph speed limit on the spine road.**
- 2.8** The waste collection team should be consulted on the proposals as there are a number of locations where, based on the refuse vehicle tracking drawings, a refuse vehicle would overhang private frontages. The tracking is also incomplete. Additional tracking would be requested specifically for the access roads serving plots 229-244 and 275-281.
- 2.8.1** **Refuse vehicle swept paths have been extended and amended. However, the estate will remain under private ownership.**
- 2.9** There are a number of pedestrian access points onto Hook Lane. The broad principle of these are acceptable and comments were made in respects of some of these at the outline planning stage. The current reserved matters plans appear to include additional and revised locations for these crossings. Little consideration appears to have been given in terms of the landings of the crossing points on the opposite side of Hook Lane. In a number of instances, the crossing points land within existing vehicle crossovers or junctions. The location of these access points should be revisited and revised where necessary.
- 2.9.1** **We understand that the positions of these crossing points is as per the approved Design Code. However, the final position will be agreed to suit existing constraints along Hook Lane.**
- 2.10** With regards to more general parking matters, the Local Planning Authority should be satisfied that the parking provision accords with their adopted standards.
- 2.10.1** **The architect has updated the parking provisions across the site to suit design comments.**
- 2.11** Although unclear at this stage what the intention is regarding highway adoption, the applicant should note that allocated parking cannot be provided within the adoptable highway. This is mentioned as the Site Layout drawing indicates a number of lay-by spaces being allocated to specific properties.
- 2.11.1** **The roads will remain private and will not be offered for adoption as highway.**
- 2.12** Provision should be made within the visitor parking provision to satisfy needs for disabled car parking spaces.
- 2.12.1** **The architectural layout has been updated.**
- 2.13** The various drawings show a cycle route around the perimeter of the site. This is as per the approved Design Code. Whilst the route is shown within the Design Code, there are aspects to this where changes would make for a better arrangement than presently indicated. On the Site Layout Northern drawing, the cycle route runs southwards and requires cyclists to join the carriageway opposite plot 59. Cyclists then rejoin the cycle route

ARUN DISTRICT COUNCIL P/132/20/RES opposite plot 50/51. It's acknowledged that the carriageways that will need to be used by cyclists will be lightly trafficked. It's unclear however why the cycle route is not being routed past plots 67 southwards to plot 54, and then rejoining the existing facility opposite plot 50. This would then provide a continuous off highway route, which is far more preferable to the arrangement shown. It is accepted that this change would not necessarily be in accordance with the approved Design Code.

2.13.1 We understand that the route follows the approved intent as per the Design Code.

2.14 There are a number of comments regarding the detailed design of the cycle route.

2.14.1 Noted

2.15 The drawings indicate that this is to be a segregated route. The segregation will presumably be via lining rather than physical features. The use of lining as a means of segregation would be contradictory to LTN 1/20 and as such this will need to be revised. In practice, it's questioned whether a segregated facility would actually be required. Flows of pedestrians and cyclists along the route are expected to be low. A shared route may therefore be appropriate in this instance. A shared arrangement would also be less intrusive in terms of signing, lining, and tactile paving.

2.15.1 The route will be a shared foot/cycle facility.

2.16 The need for the cycle route running on the southern side of the access road from plot 244 to 230 is questioned. At plot 230, cyclists are required to join the carriageway. From that point, the only option is to use the carriageway. The length of access road between plot 244 and 230 will be relatively lightly trafficked, and as such cyclists could join the carriageway near plot 244 and make use of the carriageway. This point is further reinforced as those properties on the north side of the carriageway (i.e. plots 231-244) have no footway requiring pedestrians to walk within the carriageway.

2.16.1 The layout has been updated to improve this item.

2.17 The arrangement of the route running on the west side of the access road between plots 292-297 must be revised. The route as shown is neither convenient or direct. The access road serves a small number of dwellings and as such cyclists can use the carriageway with opportunities to join the cycle way provided adjacent to plot 292 and 297. This would make for a far more direct and practical arrangement than shown.

2.17.1 The layout has been updated to improve this item.

2.18 The submitted drawings should be revised to account for the above comments.

2.18.1 Noted

