

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Claire Potts
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	8 June 2021
LOCATION:	Land South of Summer Lane & West of Pagham Road Pagham
SUBJECT:	P/83/21/DOC Approval of details reserved by condition imposed under ref P/140/16/OUT relating to Condition No 6 - design code masterplan
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

Comments are made in respects of highway and transport related matters. As the points within the Design Code are unnumbered, comments are made against specific page numbers.

P27 – Some of the road widths indicated are potentially too great. The use of 7.3 metres wide roads within a development of this nature seems very out of keeping and could lead to difficulties in achieving the 20mph design speeds quoted on page 26. 6.1 metre wide roads should also be used only where necessary (i.e. on links connecting directly onto the existing highway network) and should then narrow rather than providing continuous 6.1 metre widths.

It may also be worth the applicant checking the design principles quoted against the cross sections within the following sections for consistency.

P33 – Mention is made of traffic calming being provided on secondary and tertiary streets. The inclusion of traffic calming is poor practice with such measures generally being included retrospectively on existing streets. For new streets, the design of the road should act to limit vehicle speeds rather than there being any reliance upon raised features or pinch points, unless of course these features have other design benefits (e.g. to assist with pedestrian movements).

P39 – With reference to the street cross section, it's unclear why a 1.2 metre wide footway is being provided on one side of the carriageway when a 2 metres wide footway is being achieved on the opposite. 2 metre wide footways should be provided on both sides of the carriageway.

The cross section also doesn't cover the design of the shared surface indicated. A cross section should be provided.

P41 – Given the nature of the road, it's unclear why the 6 to 7.3 metre carriageway widths are proposed on the cross section. These widths are greater than those proposed for the primary road. The road widths should be reduced to better reflect the intended use.

P43 – Similar to the point above, the cross section indicates potentially quite wide road widths. The 6.1 metre width seems too generous and should be reduced or at least confirmation provided that this width will not be provided continuously with there being an intention to reduce the carriageway width further into the development.

P45 – The cross section is just for shared surfaces although roads with separate footways are also indicated within these areas. A cross section should be provided for both shared surfaces and roads with separate footways.

P47 – Similar to points already made, the 6.1 metre wide carriageway seems inappropriate and should be reduced or at least confirmation provided that this width will not be provided continuously with there being an intention to reduce the carriageway width further into the development. The cross section also covers solely the arrangement of road with separate footway rather than also an arrangement for shared surfaces.

P49 – Whilst more a point of clarity, reference is made in the text to standard roads with footways. Whereas the cross section indicates only shared surfaces. This section should be updated to be consistent.

P53 – There are no cross sections for the proposed highway design. No mention is made of the potential for works within the carriageway to assist with pedestrian crossing movements or the potential for a school safety zone. Such measures should be referred to with the detail to follow as part of further detailed designs.

It's recommended that the Design Code is altered in light of the above comments or further information provided to justify the principles proposed.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services