

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:David Easton
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	12 August 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. An amendment received.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

Comments have been made previously in respects of the originally submitted Design Code. The revised Design Code is duly noted and has been reviewed against these earlier comments.

P28 – It should be checked to ensure the details set out within this section are consistent with the details contained within the location specific areas elsewhere in the document. As examples, there are some differences between the road widths quoted (there are no cross sections indicating carriageway widths of 3.7 to 4.8 metres wide) and none of the cross sections for shared surfaces reflect the provision of service margins as outlined in the details on this page.

P45 – The footway widths were questioned as part of the initially WSCC comments, albeit the notation on the cross section was interpreted as reading 1.2 metre wide footway rather than 1-2 metres. Nevertheless, the cross section should seek to achieve 2 metre wide footways on both sides of the carriageway as a 1 metre wide footway is otherwise quite narrow. At the very least the 1 metre minimum should be increased to 1.5 metres.

P45 – With the shared surface cross section, if the shared surface is to be offered for adoption the applicant should note that margins would be required on both sides of the shared surface. For adoptable areas, the margins should be a minimum of 500mm wide. The expectation is that the margins would be of sufficient width to avoid any services being placed within the shared surface itself.

P57, P61, P65 – Similar to the above point, margins would be required along both sides of the shared surfaces if these are to be adopted as public highway.

The only other point to mention in general regarding the shared surface areas is the need for defined parking areas to be provided. The references to parking within shared surfaces at present covers that for residents but not informal/visitor parking arrangements.

As noted already, details of margins alongside shared surfaces are covered by the details on P28. However the actual street cross sections do not reflect these with the required margins potentially encroaching significantly into front gardens.

P72 – Within the Street Typology, there is no mention of the need for appropriate traffic management or school safety zone features. The overall carriageway width for this section of road is acknowledged but there must be appropriate design features to aid pedestrians crossing and restrict vehicle speeds. These are considered essential given the community uses that surround this length of road.

Overall, the broad principles in highway terms are mostly acceptable. There are still various matters that would benefit from reviewing to ensure consistency throughout the Design Code document.

Ian Gledhill
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services