

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:David Easton
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	8 December 2021
LOCATION:	Land South of Summer Lane and West of Pagham Road Pagham
SUBJECT:	P/167/21/RES Approval of reserved matters (appearance, layout, landscaping and scale) following outline planning Permission P/140/16/OUT for the erection of 375no. dwellings, together with public open space, play space, drainage, parking and associated infrastructure, landscape, ancillary and site preparation works, with access off Pagham Road. This site may affect a Public Right of Way.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

1. The current applications appears to be a duplicate of P/153/21. As such, the comments below have previously been issued.
2. The only apparent difference between the current application and P/153/21 is the revision number of Landscape General Arrangement Plans. For P/153/21, a later revision (revision A) has been included, whereas for the current application there is no revision number. It's not readily apparent what differences there are between the revision numbers and therefore the plans. The Site Plan, and therefore the overall layout, otherwise remains identical between the two applications.
3. Comments are made in respects of,
 - Site Plan, drawing number 21.003.02
 - Landscape General Arrangement Plans 1-5, drawing numbers L01, L02, L03, L04, L05
 - Transport Statement, reference TW/PL/ITB16481-002C
4. The site is acknowledged as having an approved Design Code (permitted under P/83/21). The approved document includes a number of principles for the highway design. As a point of principle, given there is an approved Design Code, it would be useful for the applicant to provide a statement demonstrating compliance with this.
5. In reviewing the current application, WSCC are commenting on the highway details in terms of planning acceptability. Unless otherwise stated, through

the current application WSCC Highways are not seeking to approve any matters relating to highway adoption and that would be reviewed as part of a highway adoption agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. This includes approving materials, street furniture (including lighting), landscaping within the highway, or highway drainage.

6. The broad details are acceptable. The use of different carriageway widths and forms of construction (i.e. traditional designs with segregated carriageways and footways, along with shared surfaces with pedestrians and vehicles using the same space) are considered appropriate in terms of the context of the development. Many of the highway principles have already been accepted through the approval of the Design Code.
7. Based on the currently adopted WSCC Road Safety Audit Policy, a Stage One Road Safety Audit would be required due to the presence of the school. This should be provided.
8. In terms of more detailed matters,
9. It's acknowledged that the school and community uses are being brought forward separately. The road serving these forms part of the current application though. Through pre application discussion with the applicant, WSCC Highways have already questioned the need for the 7.3 metre wide road across the school frontage; this road width is considered at odds with the 20mph design speed proposed. This aside, very limited consideration appears to have been given particularly to the potential demands arising from the school site (i.e. parent parking, dwell space/footway widths along the frontage) or the need for school safety zone type features (e.g. enforceable restrictions (i.e. 'School Keep Clear and No Waiting At Any Time (which may need to be wrapped around onto Pagham Road also). The applicant will need to incorporate such elements into the design.
10. Whilst the Design Code permits a range of road widths for quaternary roads, the width used for the road serving plots 253-258/267-270 is questionable given the number of dwellings served from this (and accounting for vehicle and pedestrian movements). It's noted that there is also no refuse vehicle tracking for this road within the TS. The road width should ideally be increased.
11. At all points where shared surfaces integrate with traditional segregated footway/carriageways, a length of footway should be continued into the shared surface area. This would avoid pedestrians conflicting with vehicles at junction.
12. Again, for shared surfaces, a contrasting material to that used in traditional carriageway construction must be used. Tarmac should not be used in

shared surfaces. There is a large extent of shared surface within the southern phase of development that is indicated to be in tarmac rather than blockwork.

13. The use of certain materials could be rationalised. For example, it's unclear why driveways and unallocated lay-by parking spaces within traditional carriageway construction are in blockwork whereas the surrounding carriageways and footways are tarmac. In the event that roads within the site are offered for adoption, WSCC will likely seek the use of tarmac for driveways and lay-by spaces where the adjacent carriageway is also tarmac.
14. For secondary roads, the Design Code, states that a footway should be provided on at least one side of the carriageway. It then goes on to identify that the footway should be on the development side of the street and a service margin provided on the opposite side of the carriageway where there is no development. Given there is development on both sides of the secondary street serving plots 289-291/367-375 and 182-183/202-207, based on the Design Code, a footway should be provided across the frontages of plots 182-183 and 202-207 as well.
15. There are quite a number of raised features indicated on the Site Plan. Some of these are in logical locations (e.g. at junctions) where these have the benefit of slowing vehicles and aiding pedestrian crossing movements. However there are a number at seemingly random locations (e.g. outside plot 244, plot 229, 349). There are also some within shared surface areas. Given the purpose of shared surface areas is to restrict vehicle speeds through the layout itself, the presence of raised features would be unnecessary. There is also an inconsistency in terms of how raised features are used at some but not all junctions. The overall use of raised features should be reviewed and the layout amended accordingly.
16. The Site Plan includes a cycle route running from Pagham Road through the southern parcel and onwards into the northern parcel to Summer Lane. The inclusion of a cycle route wasn't referenced within the Design Code. Nevertheless, the inclusion of this route is welcomed and would offer a benefit to those who would be unwilling to cycle on the carriageway with traffic. It is recommended that the route is provided as a shared surface rather than segregated facility, which would require significantly more signing and lining.
17. The only issue otherwise with the cycle route is that this runs directly onto Pagham Road within the southern parcel. The approved access design gave consideration only to pedestrians. It didn't include specific provision for cyclists that may be wishing to join or leave the proposed route within the development. The applicant would need to give further consideration in terms of the integration of the cycle route and Pagham Road. This may in

turn have implications upon the approved southern access design. Alternately, given the purpose of the route is to serve the development, the cycle route could terminate within the development rather than at Pagham Road.

18. Related to the above point, the Site Plan appears to include two additional pedestrian access points onto Pagham Road; one in front of plot 344 and another at the very southern edge of the development. The inclusion of these additional accesses are not necessarily issues, although the need for the new southern access is perhaps questionable. There would still need to be consideration as to how pedestrians using these then access the wider highway network (i.e. is there somewhere for pedestrians to safely cross to and is there adequate visibility in light of the speed limit?). The applicant would need to consider and provide further pedestrian crossing infrastructure.
19. Parking is understood to comply with the Arun District Parking Standards, although different numbers are quoted in the Planning Statement and Transport Statement. The exact number of parking spaces should be clarified. It's also unclear whether the scheme proposes any disabled car parking spaces; 5% of all spaces should be designed to meet the requirements as specified in Manual for Streets. A plan would also be required showing the location of electric vehicle charging for those properties that do not have a driveway or garage.
20. Although indicatively indicated on the Site Plan, further detail would be needed for the more northerly access into the adjoining phase of development at Church Barton Farm (P/25/17). Tracking should also be provided from the accesses into this adjoining phase of development.
21. The quality of the scanned in images of the vehicle tracking in the TS is quite poor. Clearer scans would be required to ensure the layout can accommodate the manoeuvring of a refuse vehicle. Likewise some of the other supporting plans are not very clear. It would be helpful if clearer images could be provided.

In summary, further information along with a number of design alterations would be required to address the above points.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services