

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATION**

DATE: 24/12/2010

**FROM: Liam Riddy TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Peter Cleveland**

SUBJECT: R/278/10

40 Broadmark Lane, Rustington

Retrospective application for a vehicular crossover

CONSULTATION DATE: 24/11/2010

RECOMMENDATION:

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

S106 contribution: £ N/A

This application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Scheme protocol for small scale proposals which include up to 5 residential units or extensions to single units accessed from roads that do not form part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). As such the comments provided by Local Development should be considered to be advice only, with respect to this planning application.

This proposal has been considered by means of a desktop study, using the information and plans submitted with this application, in conjunction with other available WSCC map information. A site visit can be arranged on request.

The application is for retrospective permission for a vehicular crossover onto Broadmark Lane. From an inspection of the plans alone, there is no apparent visibility issue from this access onto Broadmark Lane, and the most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in this location. WSCC would recommend, however, that pedestrian visibility of 2x2m be provided at the access in the interests of pedestrian safety – and this would require the arrangements to be modified.

The access should be constructed to a specification which meets the approval of the Area Engineer (Western); however WSCC would advise that the crossover should be constructed from a bound material for the first 5m back from the highway to prevent loose material from being dragged onto the highway. An acceptable arrangement for the control of loose material can be discussed with the Area Engineer.

WSCC would not be minded to raise any safety concerns regarding the gradient of the access, providing that it does not exceed 1:10 for the first 5.5m back from the carriageway and from an inspection of the drawings this would appear to be the case. The Applicant would also be advised that no surface water should discharge onto the public highway.

In summary, WSCC would not raise any highway safety objections to this vehicular crossover. However, the Applicant should modify the crossover to comply with the advice provided above in order to ensure that the access meets the correct highway specification.

**Liam Riddy
Local Development**