

FROM: Ian Gledhill TO: Arun District Council
FAO: David Innes

SUBJECT: P/140/16/OUT - Outline application for access only - mixed use development comprising of up to 400 dwellings, a care home with up to 70 beds, a Local Centre comprising up to 2000sqm of A1/A2/A3/D1/sui generis floorspace, provision of land for a 1FE primary school (with sufficient space to ensure that it is expandable to 2FE), provision of land for a scout hut, safeguarding of land to help link the site to the Pagham Harbour Cycle Route & other community uses including public open space & allotments with some matters reserved. This application is a departure from the Development plan.

An amendment received.

Land South of Summer Lane & West of, Pagham Road, Pagham, West Sussex

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. West Sussex County Council, in its role as Local Highway Authority, has previously issued comments on this proposal. A number of matters were raised that required additional information or clarification. Additional assessment work has now been submitted by the applicant.
2. In quite broad terms, there are two aspects to the revised assessment now provided; one part relating to the development for the current planning application and secondly a cumulative assessment that includes all developments presently under consideration in the Pagham area.
3. For the purposes of the cumulative assessment, discussions are on-going involving all developers and the LHA. Formal comments will be made on the cumulative assessment, including the mitigation required for all sites, once these discussions have concluded and the cumulative impacts known. It is not intended to provide further formal comments on ATA/02/A and ATA/03/A (both dated March 2017) at this time.
4. With respects to those matters raised by the LHA covering only the current application site, these are responded to within TA/01/A (March 2017). Taking these matters, the following further comments are offered.

Access

5. Various matters were raised relating to the principle of the access arrangements as well as the detailed design. The LHA still consider that the provision of right turning lanes conflict with the design principles within Manual for Streets 2. However, the LHA also recognise that local carriageway widening is necessary in order to accommodate pedestrian refuges. The right turning lanes are not provided for capacity or safety reasons.
6. The LHA have therefore viewed the access designs on the basis of providing carriageway widening for the pedestrian refuges rather than for the specific purpose of accommodating formal Design Manual for Roads and Bridges compliant right turning lanes.

7. In terms of more detailed matters, the pedestrian refuges have been widened to 2 metres. Kerb to kerb carriageway widths between the refuges and carriageway edge exceed the required WSCC minimum widths of 3.5 metres. Where necessary at the northern access, build outs are included to ensure that pedestrians do not cross between parked cars.
8. A further pedestrian crossing point is provided on the southern side of the access to the Parish Council's car park along with a build out on the opposite side of the carriageway. This lies immediately adjacent to a residential access. Although the tracking drawings (which is based on OS data rather than a topographical survey) indicates that a standard vehicle could turn into the residential access, in practice given the close vicinity of the build out to the access, it would be more desirable to extend the footway on the northern side of the carriageway and relocate the crossing further north (for example to the immediate east of the Parish Council car park access).
9. The access (for motorised and non-motorised road users) arrangements have been the subject of a Stage One Road Safety Audit. The majority of problems have been positively resolved. There are several problems that require further comment,
 - a. 2.1.1 – The bus stop lay-by is understood to be the same dimensions as that already present. Providing it is demonstrated that a bus can stop entirely within this, the dimensions are accepted.
 - b. 2.2.1 – Requires the provision of a central island to prevent overtaking within the hatched area at the bus stop. A traffic island has been provided. It has previously been advised that the LHA have experienced issues with vehicles overtaking on the wrong side of traffic islands in order to pass a stopped bus. Having reviewed this, it is suggested that the traffic island is upgraded to a pedestrian refuge (this will then fulfil problem 2.3.1), and the matter of the vehicles overtaking buses considered as part of any Stage 3 Safety Audit once the works are in place. If issues do occur, a solution would be to relocate the bus stop rather than remove a pedestrian crossing off a desire line.
10. Details for the other safety audit problems can be checked through the detailed design.

Highway Capacity

11. Matters here relate more to discounting trip rates for the local centre, convenience store, and schools to ensure a more reflective rate was used. The LHA have previously acknowledged that the trip rate applied within the original TA is reflective of a worst case. The updated distribution has been discussed and agreed previously.
12. The only other matter that warrants further comment at this stage is the LinSig model used for the Gossamer Lane/Nyetimber Lane/Grosvenor Gardens junction. This still doesn't appear to include the pedestrian phases that are present on all arms. Notwithstanding this, the additional queues and delays resulting from the south of Summer Lane development alone compared with the without development scenario would not be considered severe.
13. The need for highway capacity mitigation to enable all three Pagham developments will be viewed holistically once the cumulative TA is available.

Sustainable Access

14. The WSCC Rights of Way team have commented separately regarding the improving the existing public rights of way in the vicinity of the site as well as providing a contribution towards the upgrading of routes towards Chichester.
15. The travel plan has also been revised. The additional travel plan measures are noted and accepted. For the other uses on the site, the expectation is that the respective operators (the school for example would have their own separate document) will prepare travel plans. The trigger points in the conditions will be reflective of this.

Conclusions

16. Aside from the on-going discussions regarding cumulative impacts, the majority of matters arising from the LHA's initial comments have been addressed. There are several matters though that would still need to be amended prior to the LHA providing a formal recommendation.

Ian Gledhill
Strategic Planning