

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO: Simon Davis
FROM:	WSSC - Highways Authority
DATE:	17 May 2021
LOCATION:	Land East of Drove Lane Yapton BN18 0EB
SUBJECT:	Y/49/21/RES Approval of reserved matters following Y/92/17/OUT for 300 No. dwellings covering landscape, layout, scale & external appearance (resubmission following Y/78/20/RES). This application affects the setting of listed buildings, affects the character & appearance of the Main Road/Church Road, Yapton Conservation Area & affects a Right of Way. This site falls within Strategic Site SD7 (Zero Rated).
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	More Information
S106 CONTRIBUTION TOTAL:	n/a

Introduction

West Sussex County Council (WSSC) have been consulted upon planning application Y/49/21/RES by Arun District Council. This application seeks Reserved Matters approval for the erection of 300 dwellings associated with the Yapton Strategic Site SD7 and outline planning consent Y/92/17/OUT for 300 dwellings and is a resubmission of Y/78/20/RES; which was refused by Arun District Council in December 2020.

Car Parking

The applicant has not stated a specific amount of car parking that is to be provided but has stated in the Design & Access Statement that the car parking is provided on the following basis:

- 2 car parking spaces for 1, 2 and 3 bed houses
- 3 car parking spaces for 4 bed houses.
- Visitor spaces are provided at 1 space per 5 dwellings.

This level of car parking provision accords with the standard set out within Arun Parking Standards SPD and therefore in principle the Highway Authority has no objections to the proposed level of provision.

The applicant has detailed on the parking plan the location of allocated car parking spaces, visitor spaces, garage spaces and car barns. This level of

provision is in accordance with the standards in the SPD and considered acceptable. The visitor spaces are considered to be well distributed across the site.

No reference has been made to electric vehicle charging provision within the submission. The Parking Standards SPD requires that all houses with a driveway and garage have an active EV charging point and all other development has a provision of at least 20%. The applicant should therefore provide clarification as to the proposed level of Electric Vehicle charging and its location. Further details could be secured via condition.

Where the applicant is providing garages these are of a size that meet the minimum size requirements set out within the Arun Parking Standards SPD. The applicant is proposing that single garages are 6.198m by 3.274m and double garages are 6.198m by 6.346m. These are therefore deemed acceptable.

Cycle Parking

The applicant is proposing the following level of cycle provision:

- 1 cycle space for 1 bed dwellings
- 2 cycle spaces for 2, 3 and 4 bed dwellings.

This level of provision accords with the Arun Parking Standards SPD and is therefore considered acceptable.

The Design & Access Statement states that each dwelling will be provided with either cycle storage space within a garage or through dedicated cycle storage facilities in the back gardens. All the proposed garage spaces are greater than the minimum requirements (6m by 3m) to accommodate the storage of a car and bike. The garages are therefore deemed to be appropriate storage for cycles. Where a property does not have a garage, the applicant proposes a shed in the rear garden. All back gardens have a separate access point which prevents the need for users to carry their bike through the property. The applicant has not submitted details of the proposed sheds in rear gardens and therefore the size and design of these have not been assessed. The applicant should ideally provide further details to ensure they are appropriate to store a cycle but further details could be secured via condition.

The applicant has submitted a drawing showing a cycle store entitled Cycle Store 2 Elevations & Floor Plans (Drawing Number PLN-1-3901). There are four separate cycle stores. Within the stores Sheffield stands are proposed which is welcomed; the design and layout of these stores are considered acceptable.

Residential Street Layout

The general layout and design of the roads accords with the principles within the Manual for Streets and is appropriate for its context in terms of creating a low speed, low vehicle movement environment. The roads design is considered to provide a permeable site by having an interconnected road layout.

The Highway Authority wishes to make the following comments and seek clarification of the following matters relating to street layout design prior to determination of the application:

- **Design Speed and visibility** – The applicant has submitted a Section 38 Agreement Plan that shows forward visibilities and visibility from side roads. These appear to be submitted on the basis of being either 2.4m x 25m or 2.4m x 17m. It is not clear from the submission as to whether the applicant intends to implement a 20mph limit, zone or design the road to 20mph and proposed a 30mph speed limit; the applicant should clarify.

Clarification should be provided as to the intended speed limit of the roads and this should accord with the WSCC Speed Limit Policy (<https://westsussex.moderngov.co.uk/documents/s5237/Speed%20Limit%20Policy.pdf>).

Given the guidance within the Manual for Streets and that the streets are designed to be low speed the proposed reduction in visibility splays in certain locations is deemed acceptable for planning purposes. There are occasions where visibility splays, especially some forward visibility, that sit outside of the extent of adoption of the highway. This may have to be reviewed at S38 stage and a covenant put in place.

- **Carriageway widths** – the applicant has shown on the S38 plan the carriageway widths of certain roads. The applicant is proposing that the spine road width is 5.5m, secondary access roads are proposed as being 4.8m wide. Some of the minor roads/cul-de-sacs are proposed as being 4.1m wide. Adoption is not a material consideration at planning stage and therefore whilst this arrangement does not warrant a refusal of planning, based upon the guidance in the Manual for Streets, there may be potential issues with the adoption of these routes where the carriageway is 4.1m wide; if they are offered for adoption. An alternative may be to retain them as private streets or re-design them as shared surfaces where appropriate.
- **Spine Road treatments** – at outline planning stage it was envisaged that the spine road through both the northern and southern parcel would be a through route, but it would be designed to deter through traffic through its design and alignment. The Highway Authority preference is that this is done via the horizontal alignment of the road making it a less attractive route than adjacent ones. The proposed route is relatively direct and therefore the applicant has proposed various block paving raised tables at

junctions. This approach is considered appropriate to help reduce vehicle speeds.

- **Cycle infrastructure along the spine road** – the applicant is proposing a 3m wide shared pedestrian/cycle route on the western side of the sites spine road. In July 2020 Government issued a revised and updated Local Transport Note 1/20 entitled Cycle Infrastructure Design. The main design parameters of this is that cyclists should be segregated from other road users. Figure 4.1 on page 33 of the guidance provides advice as to the appropriate level of provision in different scenarios. The applicant should review the design against the advice contained within LTN 1/20. It is acknowledged that if a segregated form of cycle provision is proposed this shall have implications upon the currently proposed landscaping/verge and therefore it would be down to the Local Planning Authority to balance these conflicting approaches.

The applicant should also consider the treatment of the cycle route at side roads and how they could give priority to pedestrians and cyclists at these locations. Again, this should be reviewed against advice within LTN 1/20.

- **Street lighting** – it is noted that the applicant has provided street lighting plans. The specific detailed design of the street lighting for the adopted roads shall be agreed as part of the Section 38 highway agreement. WSCC's street lighting is managed by SSE as part of a PFI contract. Further details can be found here https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/7035/lighting_dev_promoted_hway_schemes.pdf.
- **Section 38 agreement** – the adoption of the road is not a material planning consideration. However, the applicant has stated that they wish WSCC as Highway Authority to adopt the internal roads. The extent of adoption shall be agreed as part of the S38 process. It is also noted that part of the land that is proposed to be adopted highway is unregistered and this would have to be addressed through the adoption process. It is also not clear why the proposed footway goes through the main area of open space rather than adjacent to the carriageway. For the purposes of the S38 agreement it would be useful to understand this.
- **Footway provision** – the footways are generally proposed as 2m in width which is welcomed and in accordance with the emerging Arun Design Guide SPD. The applicant has now amended the scheme where a footway was provided only on one side of the road and has now provided a footway on both sides of the where houses are proposed on each side. This revised arrangement is welcomed by the Highway Authority. This amendment is proposed between plots 79 to 84. It should be noted that the footway provision in this location is only 1.5m wide; which is below the requirements in the Arun Design Guide SPD. Whilst below the guidance

levels quoted the 1.5m width is still considered acceptable given the location, at the end of no vehicle through routes and the likely number of pedestrians using these footways.

- **Broken links at the end of cul-de-sacs** – the applicant has rightly ensured that the ends of cul-de-sacs continue to provide pedestrian access to the next cul-de-sac eg between plots 216 and 215 and 136 and 137. However, these are only pedestrian routes. These should be designed to provide a safe means of access for both pedestrians and cyclists whilst preventing vehicle access. All arrangements of this type should be reviewed to ensure access for cyclists and ensure a permeable and inter-connected cycle network is provided. A suitable modal filter may be the best way to retain pedestrian and cycle access whilst restricting vehicular access.
- **Footway provision from the site access** – Given that the majority of pedestrian movements shall be from the east of the site access the Highway Authority would look for a 2m wide footpath on the eastern side of the site access running down to join the footway near plot 1.

Also on the main site access road between the first crossing as you enter the site just before plot 1 to plot 143 there are very few if any opportunities to cross the spine road due to the location of vehicle crossovers and proposed landscaping this creates a barrier to pedestrian movements and therefore should be reviewed and pedestrian crossing points provided at appropriate design lines.

- **Straight sections of roads** – there are certain sections of road that are relatively straight with no treatments where vehicle speeds may be an issue. These occur for example between plots 14-21, 140-165 and 223-273. Consideration should be given to means of restricting vehicle speeds in these locations. Consideration should also be given to a raised feature to slow vehicle speeds where the cycle link heading to Drove Lane crosses the road. This has been done at one of the points but not the other.
- **PROW** – Colleagues within Public Rights of Way teams have been made aware about the application to see if they have any comments about the design in relation to the PROW network.

Summary

Prior to determination of the application the applicant should provide clarification and amend the design of the scheme as detailed within the Highway Authority comments. WSCC should be re-consulted on any amended plans.

Steven Shaw
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services