# WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

| | |
|---|---|
| **TO:** | Arun District Council<br>FAO: Raymond Cole |
| **FROM:** | WSCC - Highways Authority |
| **DATE:** | 3 September 2021 |
| **LOCATION:** | Land North of Sefter Road & 80 Rose Green Road<br>Pagham |
| **SUBJECT:** | P/49/21/RES<br>Application for the approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to condition 1 (Reserved Matters details), condition 6 (Design Code Masterplan) & condition 7 (landscaping & layout details) following the grant of P/134/16/OUT for the erection of 250 No. dwellings, (including affordable homes), replacement scout hut, land for an Ambulance Community Response Post Facility, demolition of No. 80 Rose Green Road & provision of Public Open Spaces including associated children's play areas, landscaping, drainage & earthworks (resubmission following P/24/20/RES). This site also lies within the parish of Aldwick. |
| **DATE OF SITE VISIT:** | n/a (desktop study undertaken – site visited as part of outline planning application) |
| **RECOMMENDATION:** | More Information Required |
| **S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:** | n/a (see terms of S106 Agreement for outline proposal) |

This is the second WSCC Highways (CHA) response to the above planning application for the approval of Reserved Matters pursuant to condition 1 (Reserved Matters details), condition 6 (Design Code Masterplan) & condition 7 (landscaping & layout details) following the grant of P/134/16/OUT for the erection of 250 No. dwellings, (including affordable homes), replacement scout hut, land for an Ambulance Community Response Post Facility, demolition of No. 80 Rose Green Road & provision of Public Open Spaces including associated children's play areas, landscaping, drainage & earthworks (resubmission following P/24/20/RES).

In its previous comments the CHA set-out the specific highway requirements. Following a meeting held in May with the applicant's transport consultant – Barton Willmore – they replied in Table xyz. Their specific replies are shown in *blue italic text* alongside the original comments made below with latest CHA comments made in ***bold red italic text*** alongside. ***Bold red underlined text*** are matters still requiring further information and/or amendments.

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 CSA/2048/140 revision 'B' produced by CSA Environmental. 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 largely respond to this (including cycle parking and garage sizes). The CHA will only respond to parking matters if a road safety issue presents itself. However, with regard to EV parking, a plan is required - including associated commentary - to demonstrate how the development would meet with the relevant guidance. 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. ***Applicant has confirmed that roads are to be offered for adoption under S38.***

   *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 through and 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 approximately 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 thew internal roads* – Plan to be provided to show these throughout the layout. ***Drawing WSC/E4775/004 G shows this. No further CHA comment.***

   Adjacent to the central section of spine road, a row of trees is shown and what appears to be a hedge. Please clarify the latter. While trees can often be accommodated close to roads and junctions, hedges should be avoided because of maintenance and visibility requirements. *A hedge has been incorporated and the*

*revised Landscape Masterplan indicates that the hedge has been pulled back from junctions to ensure visibility is not impaired.* ***No further CHA comment.***

*Cycling routes* - a 3.0m wide off-road shared footway/cycleway is shown starting at the junction with Sefter Road. It is then shown travelling north alongside the carriageway but requires users to cross the spine road from east to west to then continue north-east into the site. However, the corresponding S278 drawing for the junction works onto Sefter Road does not show a cycle route. As such, the applicant should re-visit this component of the scheme and show how both the highways works plan (S278) and the internal layout would work together and how cycle routes enter and leave the internal carriageways. *It was confirmed at the meeting with the CHA (May 2021) that the S.278 drawings would be updated to reflect the requested amendments.* ***While the S278 drawings have been updated, they do not reflect the conversation and exchange of correspondence had with the applicant's agent (Terry Seymour of RCP). While markings and signage etc. can be addressed at the S38/detailed design stage, there is still a need to see how the cycle route enters and leaves the spine road as this is still not shown as discussed.***

Continuing with that currently shown on the internal layout drawing, the route then carries-on eastwards into the main part of the development where it invites uses 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).

The internal layout appears to show a number of linked paths that appear wide enough for use by pedestrians and cyclists. However, since the outline planning consent, Local Transport Note 1/20 (Cycle infrastructure design) has been produced. As such, the applicants should provide information demonstrating how the internal cycle infrastructure meets the guidance contained in that document. This should also include entry and exit points to the site from Sefter Road and Rose Green Road. ***Please see comments above (applicable to both Sefter Road and Rose Green Road access points). And, a response to the comment made about LTN 1/20 is still required.***

At present, there is insufficient detail shown about the paths themselves – i.e. are they proposed to be shared or segregated etc. Also, what details are to be shown at road crossings and at start and end of paths? Access by bicycle to and from the 'central' foot and cycle route is not shown other than by footpaths. This should be amended – particularly to enable access from the side where the houses are (north of the path). Finally, the paths shown circumnavigating the development (generally in 'buff' colouring) would benefit being wider for use by pedestrians and cyclists, thereby providing improved (and circuitous) infrastructure for users of the development.

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 other 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). This needs to be clarified alongside any cycle markings, paving and signage that are likely to be required too. The correct tactile and/or Corduroy paving and pram

ramps should also be provided at all crossing points for footways and cycle paths (currently not shown on the latest drawings). Please also see comments below under *walking routes*.

*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. ***This will need to be picked-up at the S38/detailed design stage.*** With regard to the circulatory walking route around the site, it is recommended that this be widened to permit use by pedestrians and cyclists as this would open-up the rest of the site for more users instead of simply pedestrians. *The circular walking route is specifically for SANG purposes, which is why a separate shared cycle/footway has been incorporated into the site. By allowing cyclist use this will erode the purposes of the SANG and double up on the separate shared cycle/footway by widening the SANG route.* ***No further CHA comment.***

Specifically with regard to the 'buff' coloured path leading off the first section of footway as one enters the site from Sefter Road, this path runs behind the first tranche of housing shown. High-quality lighting and planting design will be required here to ensure that this does not become an area that people choose not to use for fear of it being too dark or not overlooked which could discourage use. It may be that routing the path past the 'north end' of the houses might be a better way to locate the path.

*Internal speed controls/traffic management on the roads making-up the internal spine road (the grey coloured roads)* – Please clarify speed control features, locations and materials proposed. Also, the first section of the spine road does not appear to have any speed controls. Applicant to re-visit and consider. ***This information is still required.***

*Car and cycle parking including visitor parking (and design thereof)* – As mentioned above, car and cycle parking numbers and design is now a matter for the LPA to consider in-line with their SPD. However with regard to visitor spaces, these should have areas of hardstanding shown behind to assist with entering and leaving vehicles. Not all are currently shown like this. ***Following discussions with the consultants it is understood that some of these parking spaces – namely the ones with landscaping adjacent – are to remain without hardstanding at the site in order to not interrupt the landscaping.*** Visitor parking opposite plots 1 and 2, 6-8, 253-258, 83 and 84, 155-158, 163-178 and 213 and 214 should be provided with hard-standings alongside them to aid getting in and out of vehicles. Visitor parking should also be provided for plots 9-15. ***This is still required.***

*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. When considering this, the applicant should also be mindful of the recommendations for cycle access contained in LTN 1/20. ***This is still 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'). ***Applicant confirms that gates will open outward but will not impinge on road safety. Looking at planning layout Drawing No. CB_84_139_002_REV 'B' shows the gate set back***

***from the edge of the road and footway. A vehicle pulling off the spine road might obstruct the footway for a very short period while the gates are opened and closed but given that visits to the pumping station are likely to be infrequent, this is unlikely to cause any significant issue. No further CHA comment.***

*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. ***To be looked at post-planning at S38/detailed design stage.***

*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). ***To be looked at post-planning at S38/detailed design stage.***

*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. ***To be looked at post-planning at S38/detailed design stage.***

**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**