

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:Raymond Cole
FROM:	WSSC - Highways Authority
DATE:	10 July 2020
LOCATION:	Land north of Hook Lane Pagham Bognor Regis
SUBJECT:	P/57/20/DOC Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under ref P/30/19/OUT relating to Condition No 6 - design code masterplan.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

The following comments would be offered in respects of the highways and transport aspects of the Design Code. As the various paragraphs in the Design Code are not numbered, comments are made in respects of the page number,

22 – The Access and Movement Plan indicates an east-west cycle route from Hook Lane into the site. There are no issues with the principle but this route must be provided on carriageway and must not be a segregated off-carriageway route. The guidance within Manual for Streets advises that cycle routes should be provided on carriageway unless there are good reasons to segregate cyclists. It's also unclear why cyclists are only permitted to use a small number of the accesses onto Hook Lane. There seems no reason why both pedestrians and cyclists could not share all the access points onto Hook Lane

23 – It's not categorically stated that the roads within the development will be offered for adoption as public highway. Comments are made on the understanding that they will. With the following exceptions/observations, the broad principles of the proposed street hierarchies are acceptable. The only elements that would need to be considered in further detail at the appropriate time are,

Swales - Reference is made to the use of localised swales. The use of such features to attenuate and drain the highway would need to be considered in detail as part of any reserved matters application and any overarching drainage strategy.

Shared Surfaces – Where shared surfaces are provided, a service margin would be required. This would be required to accommodate services and enable maintenance of the carriageway edge. The width of the margin should be adequate to accommodate the services within it but must be no less than 500mm wide. The typical sections should allow for a service margin.

Localised Narrowings – The road design itself (the width and alignment should be used to calm vehicle speeds rather than requiring further narrowings. Narrowings should in any case be avoided on shared surface routes.

29 – Reference to the 3 metre cycleway link should be removed. Given the lightly trafficked nature of the road, there's no requirement for a segregated cycleway. To provide such a feature would directly conflict with current guidance. It's notable also that no segregated cycleways are provided anywhere else within the site or the surrounding highway network. The provision of a segregated route would not be consistent with the existing and proposed highway network.

As overarching comments,

Parking – There's no reference to the parking standards against which parking across the site will be determined.

Visitor Parking – Although mentioned on page 23, there are no further references within the more detailed design code's within Section 4. Unallocated visitor parking must be provided across the site.

School Provision – The s106 agreement secures a potential school site within this development. Whilst acknowledged that the school may be located elsewhere and not with the development, the Design Code should still really account for the potential to include a school. Again it's accepted that the school will be subject to a separate reserved matters application, all of the roads serving the school still form part of the current Design Code application. The road design would have to recognise the potential for on-street parking demands at drop off and picking up times.

In summary, it's recommended that the Design Code is revised to account for the above matters.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services