

FROM: Ian Gledhill **TO:** Arun District Council
FAO: Simon Davis

SUBJECT: P/58/15/OUT - Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of 90 No. dwellings with associated access & open space. This is a Departure from the Development Plan.

Land at, Summer Lane, Pagham, PO21 4NG

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Background

The current application is seeking outline planning permission with only matters of access to be approved at this stage. Comments are offered in respects of the on-site arrangements. However these are taken to be indicative and therefore subject to change.

The Local Highway Authority has issued pre application advice in respects of this proposal. This includes the proposed highway works on Summer Lane and Pagham Road. Where appropriate, the LHA refer to the advice given at the pre app stage.

It is also noted that the site was proposed to be allocated for a residential development of 90 dwellings within the Pagham Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed allocation required improvements to be undertaken to Summer Lane and it's junction with Pagham Road. The Pagham NP has however been withdrawn.

Trip Generation and Highway Capacity

The TS includes an estimate of potential vehicle movements. This has been based upon the use of TRICS data. TRICS is a database of traffic surveys of other similar located and nature completed developments. The database can be refined to select sites comparable to that proposed. Comments were made by the LHA at the pre app stage in respects of the selection criteria applied. The LHA at that time advised that the selection parameters (namely the population within 1 and 5 miles of the site) should be revisited and revised to better suit the location of the development. It would appear that the TRICS parameters have not been revised. Further comments are made below in respects of the trip rates and the overall capacity impact of this development.

Notwithstanding the above, the development is forecast to generate 45 two way vehicle movements (12 arrivals, 33 departures) in the AM peak period (0800-0900) and 50 two way movements (31 arrivals, 18 departures) in the PM peak (1700-1800).

To determine where off junction-site capacity assessments are required in accordance with the WSCC Transport Assessment Guidance, the development traffic has been distributed across the highway network using Census 2011 Travel to Work data. It is recognised that not all vehicle trips will be for employment purposes. However the employment centres will also contain other services and amenities, these will therefore be expected to attract vehicle movements. The use of Census 2011 data for trip distribution purposes is considered appropriate.

Based on this data, 98% (44 movements in the AM peak and 49 in the PM peak) will head northwards once exiting Summer Lane. Of this, 56% of vehicle movements (amounting to 25 vehicle movements (7 arrivals, 18 departures) in the AM peak and 27 (17 arrivals, 10 departures) in the PM peak) will arrive or depart northwards on the B2166 towards Chichester. The remaining 44% will travel eastwards. This amounts to 19 northbound (5 arrivals, 14 departures) in the AM peak and 22 eastbound (13 arrivals, 8 departures) movements in the PM peak.

Eastbound movements have a choice of routes, either along Nyetimber Lane, Hook Lane or Sefter Road. The end choice will depend upon destination. Based on route availability, eastbound vehicle movements would dissipate quickly.

In light of route choices and the number of vehicle movements, a capacity assessment has only been undertaken at the Summer Lane/Pagham Road junction. In all scenarios modelled, this junction is forecast to work well within capacity.

As noted above, it is appreciated that the TRICS trip rate applied has not been refined so as to be wholly representative of the proposed development location. The LHA has independently checked the vehicle trip rates. If more representative parameters were applied, higher trip rates would result with 52 (14 arrivals, 38 departures) in the AM peak and 56 (38 arrivals, 17 departures) in the PM peak. Even with these, the impact upon the local highway network would not be significant given the distribution of traffic. In this instance, there would be limited merit in undertaking further capacity assessments using more representative vehicle trip rates.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds when the residual cumulative impacts are severe. It's not considered that this proposal would result in any severe highway capacity impacts.

Access

The development is to take vehicular access at two points from Summer Lane. Only part of Summer Lane forms part of the adopted highway network; this being the section from Pagham Road to the western boundary of no. 7 Summer Lane. Westwards beyond this, the road is not maintained by WSCC as public highway. As such the eastern access is proposed directly onto the public highway, whilst the western access is onto the unadopted road. It is noted that the legal line of footpath no. 100 follows the route of Summer Lane.

Both accesses are shown as priority junctions. The principle of this form is accepted in light of the nature of Summer Lane and the development proposed. Both access points appear to be shown with 6 metre kerb radii, which are again considered suitable. The access road widths leading into the development differ between the east and west access points; the east access appears shown as 4.2 metres whilst the western access is nearly 6 metres. It is recommended that a consistent width of at least 4.8 metres is achieved at both access points. Visibility splays are also only shown at the western access looking east; visibility splays would need to be shown at both junctions in both directions.

Plans are submitted showing Summer Lane being widened within the existing highway constraints and/or involving land under the control of the applicant. The works within the unadopted highway can achieve a consistent 4.8 metre carriageway and 1.8 metre footway. There are however quite a number of constraints within the adopted section.

In order to achieve a consistent 1.8 metre wide footway, the carriageway width is shown reduced below 4.8 metres over distance of approximately 40 metres. The

width would vary over this but at the narrowest the carriageway would be 4.1 metres. Manual for Streets suggests that this width is adequate to enable two cars to pass at slow speed. However this is still particularly tight. The narrowest location is also in the immediate vicinity of the eastern access.

The arrangement shown would also involve relocating the existing narrow footway from the southern side of Summer Lane to the north. In principle, there would be benefit to this given the widening of the footway that would result. Removing the footway from the southern side of the carriageway may have consequences for visibility from the accesses for those existing dwellings. It would appear that visibility may be substandard based on the existing arrangements, the proposed works would potentially worsen matters. Again, this matter should be appropriately considered with it determined how much of an impact would result from relocating the footway.

No swept paths have been provided at the access points. This is especially pertinent given the narrow carriageway width in the vicinity of the eastern access. The applicant was advised at the pre application stage to consider narrowing the proposed footway to enable localised carriageway widening. Swept paths would need to be provided and the carriageway width revisited accordingly.

No waiting restrictions are shown in the immediate vicinity of the eastern access. Waiting restrictions will be the subject of a further statutory consultation process. As such the outcome cannot be guaranteed. The proposal would need to be shown as deliverable in the event that the traffic regulation order process failed.

There is also a potential issue relating to the build-ability of the footway arrangement as shown. There is quite a notable gradient on the driveways of the two properties, Moonrakers and Shelig. The gradient on both falls towards Summer Lane with the cross fall of Summer Lane appearing to fall towards these properties. The construction of a footway on the north side of Summer Lane would involve the building up of the carriageway to create a segregated arrangement. Due to the gradients on the driveways it's unclear how the driveways would then tie into the footway without resulting in a significant step from the private driveways onto the footway. Alternately, works would be required to the driveways of both properties that lie outside of the control of the applicant and the LHA. It's suggested that a cross section is provided showing the ability to provide the footway in light of the existing driveway gradients.

Works are also proposed to the Summer Lane/Pagham Road junction. This involves the slight realignment of the junction and the building out of the kerbline to the immediate north and south of Summer Lane to increase visibility for emerging vehicles. Whilst this narrows Pagham Road, a residual kerb to kerb width of 7.3 metres is retained. This is still adequate to enable two opposing buses or large vehicles to pass.

All of the proposed highway works have been the subject of a Stage One Road Safety Audit. This raises quite a number of problems, the majority but not of all of which have been positively addressed by the designer. There are two problems that the LHA consider need further investigation.

The first relates to clearance to boundary features on the southern side of Summer Lane with the proposed scheme including no margin to existing features. It is normal practice to provide clearance of 450mm (300mm absolute minimum) to features alongside the carriageway to ensure these are not struck. Such clearance would appear achievable in certain locations where the carriageway widens to over 5 metres. The designer is recommended to revisit the design to determine if a margin

can be provided along the southern side of Summer Lane. Depending on the outcome of this, the LHA may need to consider an exception report.

The second problem is in regards of visibility for northbound pedestrians on Pagham Road at the Summer Lane junction. The realignment of the junction does however reduce intervisibility between pedestrians and those vehicles exiting Summer Lane. It is acknowledged that options are limited given the visibility is primarily restricted by the fence of the adjacent property. In addressing the above problem (clearance to features), there may be the possibility of provide a narrow margin. This in turn may assist in the positioning of pedestrians crossing and visibility to oncoming vehicles. An exception report may need to be prepared by the LHA in respects of this matter if this cannot be addressed.

To allow the LHA to process the potential exception reports, a signed and dated designer's response would be needed. Copies of all plans referred to within the Stage One RSA should also be provided.

The LHA acknowledge the merits of the highway works shown. However there are a number of matters that could influence the build-ability.

Internal Arrangements and Parking

The current application seeks outline permission with only access to be approved at this stage. The on-site arrangements are therefore taken to be indicative. The layout shown comprises of a segregated carriageway/footway arrangement, with several areas of shared surface. No widths are indicated and these would need to be demonstrated as adequate as part of any reserved matters submission. Road widths would need to take account of the intended parking provision within the development (and thus the possibility of on-street parking taking place) and the swept path of a refuse vehicle. The more easterly of the two proposed access roads is shown as continuing northwards, presumably to serve further development referred to within the TA. It's unclear when exactly this may come forward. As such, the access road should be shown terminating to a standard geometry turning head.

Accessibility

The TA considers the accessibility of the site by sustainable modes. There are various services and amenities within the maximum 2km walking distance applied. Footways are lit and continuous alongside carriageways. Further improvements are proposed along Summer Lane to widen the existing footway. Arrangements are considered conducive towards enabling trips on foot.

For cyclists, whilst there are limited specific facilities available, the local topography and road conditions (traffic flows and vehicle speeds) are not such to be prohibitive. This is especially so for eastbound movements. Northwards the nature of the Pagham Road and B2166 does change and is subject to a higher speed limit. It is acknowledged that traffic conditions heading northwards may deter less experienced cyclists.

The nearest bus stops to the site are to the immediate north and south of the Summer Lane/Pagham Road junction. A Monday to Saturday bus frequency of 15 minutes is provided towards both Chichester and Bognor Regis. The frequency of the service available and the destinations served would make the bus a realistic alternative for some trip purposes.

Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, and for safe and suitable access to be achieved for all people. In light of the routes available for walking and cycling, as

well as the bus service available it is considered that residents would have a realistic mode choice and would not be reliant upon the use of the private car for all trips.

Other Matters

Suitable mitigation would need to be implemented during construction. Such matters can be covered via condition. The applicant should note that a Section 59 Agreement under the 1980 Highways Act would be required for that length of Summer Lane that forms part of the adopted highway. A s59 Agreement would enable the LHA to recover from the developer the cost of repairing any damage that occurs as a result of the increase of extraordinary traffic during construction.

Conclusion

Whilst the broad principle of the development is accepted, there are a number of matters that would need to be addressed relating to the access works and the problems raised by the Stage One Road Safety Audit.

Ian Gledhill
Strategic Planning