

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	<u>Arun</u> District Council <u>FAO:</u> Michael Eastham
FROM:	<u>WSCC</u> - Highways Authority: Tim Townsend
DATE:	27 March 2020
LOCATION:	Land to the south of Ford Lane and east of North End Road <u>Yapton BN18 0DS</u>
SUBJECT:	<u>Y/19/20/RES</u> Approval of reserved matters following outline consent Y/80/16/OUT for 4.5ha of residential development comprising of 3.4ha of land for the erection of 100 No. dwellings (up to 30 (30%) affordable housing) together with 1.1ha of land set aside for public open space & strategic landscaping & 2.2ha of public open space & green corridors with vehicular access from Ford Lane & pedestrian/cycle access only from North End Road. This application may affect the setting of listed buildings, affects the character & appearance of the Church Lane, Yapton Conservation Area & affects a Public Right of Way. Further information received.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	<u>n/a</u> for purposes of this RES application (visited at outline stage)
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information Required
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	(See S106 Agreement secured as part of outline planning consent)

This is the WSCC County Highway Authority (CHA) response to the above planning application for approval of reserved matters following outline consent Y/80/16/OUT for 4.5ha of residential development comprising of 3.4ha of land for the erection of 100 No. dwellings (up to 30 (30%) affordable housing) together with 1.1ha of land set aside for public open space & strategic landscaping & 2.2ha of public open space & green corridors with vehicular access from Ford Lane & pedestrian/cycle access only from North End Road. This application may affect the setting of listed buildings, affects the character & appearance of the Church Lane, Yapton Conservation Area & affects a Public Right of Way.

The comments below specifically respond to the following matters:

- Internal access roads
- Access for non-motorised users
- Access for emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles
- Parking provision (including cycle and visitor parking)
- Road adoption (S38 Agreement)

Should the case officer consider additional matters need consideration by the CHA, he should contact the author at the earliest opportunity.

- 1. Internal access roads** – The first section of access road taken from Ford Lane up to plot 9 appears to measure 5.5m wide. Turning westwards, the access road appears to continue at a width of 5.5m up to plot 93. Beyond this, the access road appears to measure 4.8m wide. This is also true for the section of road serving plots 1-5 and 24-33. No access road should measure less than 4.8m wide as this can lead to difficulties for emergency and refuse vehicles (although in-line with Manual for Streets guidance, accesses can - for short distances only - be narrower). In the case of the layout as submitted, the sections serving plots 6, 7, 15-18, 36-45 and 54-58 have access 'roads' in the form of shared surfaces measuring between 4.1-4.8m wide. However, these and all the internal access roads have been 'tracked' for refuse and emergency vehicles and plans appear to demonstrate that such vehicles can reach all properties.

With regard to the design of the roads and access ways, footways are shown in specific places alongside either one side or both sides of the main access roads. In-line with advice in Manual for Streets, the internal roads where footways are proposed should ideally have footways provided on both sides as otherwise this could give a mixed-message to users. Also in places, desire-lines for walking trips appear to have been omitted which again could lead to users getting a mixed-message or simply walking where they wouldn't normally. As such, it is recommended that pedestrian provision alongside access roads be re-visited throughout the scheme – particularly the section serving plots 1-5 and the section south and west of plot 93 (so the western portion of the site). The shared driveway/accesses serving plots 6, 7, 15-18, 36-45 and 54-58 are specifically shown as shared surfaces without footways and subject to adequate spaces being available to turn vehicles and cater for visitors parking, these areas are largely acceptable (but see comments below about parking).

Street lighting would need to meet SSE requirements which would be looked at in detail at any detailed design/S38 stage.

Finally, the applicant should demonstrate how traffic speeds would be controlled within the estate layout and why the chosen visibility splays shown are acceptable. Particular attention should be given to the access road running along the eastern side of the scheme.

- 2. Access for non-motorised users** – As well as new sections of footways alongside Ford Lane, a pedestrian connection appears to be shown to North End Road which, in turn, leads to off-site footway improvements along this road. Access protection barriers – both within the site and on the public highway will be required here to protect users and be designed to cater for those who are mobility impaired and those with pushchairs. Further scrutiny of the plans appear to show that there might be two openings proposed to North End Road. If this is the case, access barriers will be required at both points – on the highway and within the site. Any non-motorised route that uses a shared surface should ensure that the needs of those who are mobility impaired (including those with sight impairment) and those with pushchairs are catered for with adequate 'guides' towards areas best suited to their needs. Of course, if cycles are intended to use any of these entrances, the appropriate widths and associated infrastructure should also be provided.

Three formal Public Rights of Way (PRoW) - Public Footpaths in this instance - run through the site – namely 357, 358 and 359. The first two provide connections between Ford Lane through the site whereas No. 359 meets 358 at the south-eastern corner of the site and then (continuing as 357) towards Church Lane.

At the outline planning application stage, the CHA recommended that as part of any RES/DOC application that any PRoW running through the site be considered to provide for shared foot and cycle use. This has not been shown as 357 appears to measure 2.0m (it should measure a minimum of 3.0m wide for shared-use) but surfaced, whereas both 358 and 359 are not shown measuring more than 1.5m wide and without surfacing. Since the outline consent, the County Council has been looking at ways to improve access by non-motorised users across the County. This extends to other non-motorised users too and it has been mentioned that access by other users such as equestrians is of interest in the area. Bridleway status for these paths would legally permit those on foot, cycle and horse to use the paths, albeit recognising that the paths would need to be upgraded, including connections in-and-out of the site.

Any PRoW being hard-surfaced would have to be included in any S38 Agreement and to a suitable specification. Any other surfacing and indeed any changes to PRoW, would need to be discussed with the CHA and meet the requirements of WSCC PRoW team. Any path upgrades to permit access over-and-above Footpath status would require appropriate Orders to be approved. WSCC PRoW team will be able to advise further and will be making its own separate response to this planning application.

With regard to other paths within the site, a recreational area appears to be shown in the south-western corner of the site. This too should be looked at with a view to providing shared-use paths for a choice of users – those on-foot and cycle at the very least. Also, a further path running NE-SW across the central green/play area would also provide a path on a desire-line for pedestrians and should, as such, be considered.

As a general point, paths crossing any access roads and/or meeting external roads (e.g. Ford Lane, North End Road and Church Lane/Road) should be provided with barriers to safeguard users at these points.

Given the above, the applicant should further examine access to, from and through the site by non-motorised users and provide this additional information to both the LPA and CHA to consider.

- 3. Access for emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles** – This is shown on Odyssey drawings 18-344/100 and 18-344/101 – both revision 'A'.
- 4. Parking provision (including cycle and visitor parking)** – *Car parking* - Parking space and garage space dimensions all appears to follow advice contained in Manual for Streets. With regard to numbers of spaces and how they are allocated throughout the development, Arun District Council parking guidance should now be followed. However as an observation, visitor parking does appear to be under-represented throughout the majority of the scheme. As such, it is recommended that the applicant re-appraise this. With regard to the visitor spaces shown on the eastern-most access road (opposite plots 26 and 31), 1.2m wide hard strips should be added to the rear of them to assist with entering and leaving vehicles.

Cycle parking – Properties with garages would have space for cycles within based on the dimensions shown on the submitted planning application drawings. Also, the flats on the western-side of the site appear to have cycle stores (albeit with limited detail of the latter being available to view). However, it is not apparent from looking at the plans where cycle parking for all other properties would take place. Applicant to provide further detail for both the flats and the properties without garages, please.

- 5. Road adoption (S38 Agreement)** – This is indicatively shown on Odyssey drawing 18-344/109 (no revision). Details might need to change depending on any revisions as mentioned above (e.g. PRow comment about path surfacing etc.). Tactile paving, pram ramps etc., will all be looked-at in at the detailed design/S38 stage.

Please re-consult with the requested additional information as documented above, at which time the CHA will consider the application further.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services