

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:Simon Davis
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	29 January 2020
LOCATION:	Rear of Inglenook Hotel 253-255 Pagham Road Bognor Regis PO21 3QB
SUBJECT:	P/58/19/PL Erection of 9 No. dwellings with associated access, parking, cycle & refuse storage & landscape design. This application is a Departure from the Development Plan & may affect the setting of a listed buiding. An amendment received.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	Yes 9th September 2019 and 20th November 2019
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	

Background

The application is for the erection of 9 dwellings on land to the rear of the Inglenook Hotel with alterations to the existing access. This further consultation response responds to the Highway Report and Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) commisioned by the Local Planning Authority (LPA); as requested by Arun members following the Planning Committee meeting where the application was considered.

The site has been previously assessed by WSCC in its role as of Local Highway Authority (LHA) and comprehensive comments have been provided to the applicants original Transport Statement. A site visit was undertaken on the 9th September 2019 by-WSCC officers. The LHA conducted a second site visit on the 20th November 2019. During this visit we were joined by local Councillor Amanda Worne and Councillor Martin Lury to discuss their concerns with the proposed development. WSCC concluded in their original comments on the application that there were no valid grounds to recommend refusal of the planning application and that subject to the inclusion of relevant planning conditions on any permission granted that the proposals were considered to be policy compliant from a transport perspective.

Latest LHA comments

Transport Note

On the request of the LPA a Transport Note (TN) was produced by Wilbar Associates which aims to give an independent assessment of the sites access strategy. The applicants Transport Consultant has also provided their own response to the Transport Note, this is available on the LPA's planning register website. The main points raised by the TN are as follows:

- The TN has concluded that the additional traffic the proposals would generate would not have a 'severe' impact on the adjoining highway network.

- Concern is raised that the swept path analysis do not take account of any parked vehicles on Pagham Road. Concerns are raised that there are no restrictions and a refuse vehicle would not be able to make a turn with the present arrangements without parking restrictions reducing the existing availability for residents and visitors on-street. We note that the applicant provided swept path analysis drawing 2017/3763/003 Rev B which demonstrates that refuse vehicles would be able to access and egress the site. The LHA observed on site there was a proportion of on-street parking on the opposite side of the carriageway (eastern side) at the time of our visit. In practice if there was the presence of parked cars it would mean that vehicles would make the right turn movement into the site from a more central position on the carriageway. The practice of vehicles entering the site from this position on the carriageway currently occurs as the access is existing. For completeness the applicant may wish to expand this drawing further by providing an additional drawing showing parked cars to the east. This would only be required for a vehicle accessing from the north. The right turn movement out of the site and left turns in from both the north and the south would be unhindered by parked cars due to the nature and location of parking and the presence of double yellow line parking restrictions and a bus stop. We are aware that the Waste Collection Authority have made comments on the arrangement and have no adverse comments to make in relation to the proposed layout.
- Concern is raised regarding parking in the layby due to the potential impact upon the visibility splays, it should be noted that Section 10.7.1 of Manual for Streets 2 (MfS) accepts that parking in visibility splays in built-up areas is quite common, yet it does not appear to create significant problems in practice. It goes on to state that in some circumstances, where speeds are low, some encroachment may be acceptable. Mindful of the speed survey data where the 85th percentile speeds were 30 and 27 mph (within the existing limit) the LHA consider this point applicable in the sites instance. The TN recommends that an RSA is undertaken on the access, this is covered in detail in the section below. The Highway Authority do not consider in this instance that the potential for parking around the site access would have a detrimental impact on road safety that would warrant a reason for refusal.
- The TN makes reference to the construction of two separate access roads taking into account the nearby Crayfern development when one could serve the same purpose and reduce the impact on Pagham Road. Our understanding was that this was explored by the applicant at the pre-application stage and an agreement was not reached to use the Crayfern access. Whilst WSCC position as Highway Authority would be that the access points be consolidated it cannot insist on this being the case if an alternative means of access is submitted. The application for consideration does not involve an access from the adjacent Crayfern development and the access from Pagham Road needs to be assessed. On the basis of the information submitted WSCC does not have any safety concerns about the access that would warrant a reason to refuse the application. It is also worth noting the access as part of the proposals will be widened and improved over its current status.

Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA)- The RSA commissioned by Arun District Council has been undertaken in line with GG/119 parameters. The RSA identifies no problems with the proposed access arrangements. There are however 3 notes which site outside of the remit of the the RSA but are for consideration to further complement the design of the development. In summary these are:

Note 01-Consideration given to highway signs advising 'Shared Surface'. The LHA would consider this appropriate in the context and that if these are proposed that they are sited on private land within the development.

Note 02- Relocating lights at the top of the fence to give an adequate spread of light. Content noted by LHA.

Note 03-Re-modelling the existing wall should aim to improve visibility for pedestrians and drivers. The should be incorporated by the applicant in the design.

The LHA would have no concerns with the proposed RSA. The notes raised above could be conditioned as part of any planning consent obtained.

Conclusion

The LHA having now assessed the latest information would still advise that our advice from previous consultations would still stand. The advice above relating the the swept path diagrams should be taken into account by the applicant. The previously advised conditions and informative would still stand. WSCC as LHA does not considered that there is any transport or highway reason that this application should be refused and that from a transport context the development is policy compliant.

Jamie Brown
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services