

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	<u>Arun</u> District Council <u>FAO:</u> Raymond Cole
FROM:	<u>WSCC</u> - Highways Authority: Tim Townsend
DATE:	6th April 2020
LOCATION:	Land North of <u>Sefter</u> Road & 80 Rose Green Road Pagham
SUBJECT:	<u>P/24/20/RES</u> Approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to <u>condition</u> 1 (Reserved Matters details), condition 6 (Design Code Masterplan) and condition 7 (landscaping and layout details) following the approval of Outline planning permission P/134/16/OUT for the erection of 280 dwellings, (including affordable homes), replacement scout hut & Ambulance Community Response Post Facility; provision of a primary vehicular access from Sefter Road; demolition of No. 80 Rose Green Road & creation of a pedestrian & emergency only access; provision of Public Open Spaces including associated children's play areas, landscaping, drainage & earthworks. This application also lies within the parish of Aldwick. This site falls within the Pagham North SD2, CIL Zone 1 (Zero Rated).
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	<u>n/a</u> for purposes of this RES application.
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	SEE S106 AGREEMENT SECURED ALONGSIDE OUTLINE PROPOSAL

This is the WSCC County Highway Authority (CHA) response to the above planning application for approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to condition 1 (Reserved Matters details), condition 6 (Design Code Masterplan) and condition 7 (landscaping and layout details) following the approval of outline planning permission P/134/16/OUT for the erection of 280 dwellings, (including affordable homes), replacement scout hut & Ambulance Community Response Post Facility; provision of a primary vehicular access from Sefter Road; demolition of No. 80 Rose Green Road & creation of a pedestrian & emergency only access; provision of Public Open Spaces including associated children's play areas, landscaping, drainage & earthworks. This application also lies within the parish of Aldwick. This site falls within the Pagham North SD2, CIL Zone 1 (Zero Rated).

1. Condition 1 (reserved matters details) – The wording of the condition refers to the following matters to be put forward at the reserved matters stage for details consideration:

- layout
- scale
- appearance
- landscaping

As these matters appear to be ones that sit within that to be considered under conditions 6 and 7 below, CHA comments in response to these matters will be

made in the sections below. All comments based on scrutiny of drawing CB_84_139_001 (no revision). Should the case officer require additional comments about other components of the proposal, he should contact the CHA at the earliest opportunity.

2. Condition 6 (Design Code Masterplan) – From the CHA’s perspective, comments below will respond to street hierarchy/layout. As Arun DC now has its own parking guidance/standards, the case officer should respond to this (including cycle parking). The CHA will only respond to parking matters if a road safety issue presents itself. With regard to lighting, SSE should be consulted for detailed comments about suitability and type of street lighting system proposed to be installed. Also at this stage, it is not known whether the internal layout will be offered for adoption under S38. Please note that any comments made in this response do not imply that the layout would be suitable for adoption as matters such as drainage, road materials etc. that often present themselves at a later stage, can often be the deciding factors. However, the applicant should be asked to confirm either-way.

Street hierarchy – While this matter is perhaps more for the LPA to respond to, from a CHA point of view, the layout appears to be made up of sections of traditional carriageway with footways alongside – generally the main spine road and some other roads leading off it – and then a series of shared-surface roads and private drives which are generally located around the periphery of the site. Additional to this, a walkway is provided around the whole site (annotated as ‘circulatory walkway’ on the submitted drawings) and a 3.0m wide shared footway/cycleway is shown alongside parts of the spine road and other internal roads, then leading to a predominantly off-road section where it links to Rose Green Road along the emergency access route (south-eastern part of the site) measuring 3.7m wide at this point. Further comments will be made under Condition 7 (landscaping and layout), below.

3. Condition 7 (landscaping and layout details) – As documented above in point 2 (condition 6), the internal road network is shown made-up of a combination traditional roads with footways running alongside (mainly the internal spine road and some of the roads leading off it) with others shown as either shared-surface roads or private driveways. Carriageway widths range from 4.8m wide (for the lesser/shared surface routes) to 5.5m wide for the main spine road.

Visibility splays at junctions and driveways where they emerge to roads and where shared foot/cycleway routes cross roads – Plan to be provided to show these throughout the layout.

Cycling routes – a 3.0m wide off-road shared footway/cycleway is shown starting at the junction with Sefter Road. It then travels north alongside the carriageway but requires users to cross the spine road from east to west to then continue north-east into the site (although this might be considered confusing to some users and will depend on visibility splays for users – and forward visibility for car drivers – being provided). The route then carries-on eastwards into the main part of the development where it invites users to cross southwards and onto another section generally travelling south-east to link-up with the emergency access to Rose Green Road (this latter section measuring 3.7m wide to cater for emergency vehicles). Also see comments below under *walking routes*.

From scrutiny of the proposed S278 plans for the junction of the new estate road where it meets Sefter Road, no shared footway/cycleway is shown, whereas the plans submitted with this RES application do show this. One possible issue arising here is how cyclists are to enter and leave this off-road route and where – particularly at the Sefter Road end. Also, it is not clear what feature or features

are being provided on or off the carriageway of the spine road to assist with users crossing and interaction with the carriageways at these locations. Further to this, signage or road markings have not been provided and in accordance with the condition, are required at this stage. It needs to be clearly shown how users will interact with one-another at all crossing points (road and foot/cycleways).

Walking routes – Where footways terminate at the start of shared surfaces, they should be carried just beyond any rumble strip feature with pram ramps provided at these points. Some areas within the layout do not show this correctly. With regard to the circulatory walking route around the site, it is recommended that this be widened to permit shared-use by pedestrians and cyclists as this would open-up the rest of the site for more users instead of simply pedestrians. Also, because of the comments found above about the location of the shared footway/cycleway route alongside parts of the internal roadways and the need to cross the road, it is recommended that the designer consider the widened circulatory route as an alternative and/or complementary shared-use route (albeit retaining some form of route alongside the carriageway itself which may or may not be suitable for cycling) and extending it in places (one example being to the south-side of the spine road opposite plots 251-277) to provide for improved connectivity throughout the internal layout and to minimise the need to cross carriageways, where possible. Some additional connections to this path at various points of the layout should be considered. Details of surfacing required too for all routes, please.

Internal speed controls/traffic management on the roads making-up the internal spine road (the grey coloured roads) – This is not clear from scrutiny of the layout drawings. There are some areas where the carriageway material is shown slightly darker grey (adjacent to plot 19 and extending southwards and another area close to plot 93) but it is not clear. The first sections of spine road do not appear to have any features. As such, the applicant should look at these parts of the layout again.

Visitor parking (design thereof) – All visitor spaces should have areas of hardstanding shown behind to assist with entering and leaving vehicles. Not all are currently shown like this. For the visitor spaces found opposite plot 6 on the first section of spine road, it is recommended that the footway shown south of it be made to join-up with it otherwise users will simply walk on the verge (wearing it) or walk in the road for a short length which some won't expect. The one opposite the public open space should also be amended this way.

Emergency access – Further details required for the entire emergency link (particularly the method of access at both ends to cater for emergency vehicles). Autotrack (or similar) diagrams showing vehicle tracking for refuse and fire appliances are required.

Pumping station access – Applicant to confirm (and show) that any gates provided adjacent to the access and back of footway and/or carriageway will open inwards (so away from the 'highway').

Road adoption – Specifications for the materials used for the internal roadways and private drives do not appear to be submitted. For any roads offered for adoption under S38, specifications must meet WSCC requirements. No phasing plan for provision of such infrastructure appears to have been provided.

Street lighting – This would be checked if roads are to be offered for adoption under Section 38. If roads are to be left private, the LPA should ensure that any lighting specification is referred to SSE for comment. It is recommended that

lighting is provided for all roads and foot/cycle routes (including circulatory route and emergency access to Rose Green Road).

Other matters (fencing/barriers alongside drainage swales/basins/ditches etc.) – the LPA should ensure that appropriate fencing/safety barriers be placed alongside drainage swales, ponds and ditches to safeguard people walking alongside them.

Conclusion.

Additional information is required. When available, please re-consult, at which time the CHA will consider the application further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services