WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Arun District Council FAO:Simon Davis
FROM:	WSCC - Highways Authority
DATE:	16 October 2020
LOCATION:	Land East of Drove Lane Yapton BN18 0EB
SUBJECT:	Y/78/20/RES Approval of reserved matters following outline consent Y/92/17/OUT for 300 No.dwellings covering landscape, layout, public open space, drainage, scale & external appearance. 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 (WSCC) have been consulted upon planning application Y/78/20/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.

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 Highway Authority would however look for the applicant to provide a breakdown (eg garage, allocated, unallocated, visitor) of the total number of car parking spaces and indicate the number of allocated and unallocated spaces.

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.

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.

The applicant has submitted a drawing showing a cycle store entitled Cycle Store 1 Elevations & Floor Plans (Drawing Number PLN-1-3900). Sheffield stands are proposed which is welcomed, whilst the design and layout is considered acceptable it is not apparent from the plans which properties these stores serve. It is assumed it is plots 25-32 and 53 to 60; but clarification should be provided.

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:

- **Design Speed** – The design speed of the roads are not apparent from the submission. The applicant has submitted a Section 38 Agreement Plan that shows forward visibilities and visibility from side roads but no dimensions are included on these plans. The applicant should provide dimensions for all visibility splays. 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).

  Some of the visibility splays sit outside the intended extent of adoption of the highway. Whilst in theory in certain areas additional areas of land could be adopted to include the visibility splay in other areas this is more problematic. For example on the bend near plots 24 and 44 the forward visibility goes across private land and is obscured by a tree. The achievable forward visibility splay should be shown and detailed on the plan.

  Visibility from the vehicle access to the rear parking court servicing plots 152 – 158 should be provided.

- **Carriageway widths** – the applicant should provide an indication as to how carriageway widths change through the side and a rational for this.

- **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. The applicant should confirm that these are all raised tables with ramps.

- **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 with 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. The applicant should note that there are sections where the adopted highway is not continuous eg in front of plot 114. 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. On certain roads the service margins/footway adjacent to the road are excluded from adoption eg outside plot 77. These need to be included within the extent of adoption. 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. There is also no footway link to the laybys in this location (opposite plots 297).

- **Footway provision** – the footways are proposed as 2m in width which is welcomed and in accordance with the emerging Arun Design Guide SPD. There are certain areas where a footway is provided on one side of the road but not the other even though properties are on both sides of the road eg plots 79 to 83. If there are properties on both sides of the road the Highway Authority would look for a footway on both sides. One side of the road should not have a lower level of provision in terms of footways.

- **Broken links at the end of cul-de-sacs** – the applicant has rightly ensured that the ends of cul-da-sacs continue to provide pedestrian access to the next cul-de-sac eg between plots 216 and 217 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 –** through the S278 agreement and the RM app it is noted that the applicant is now proposing alternative pedestrian access arrangements to that agreed at outline planning stage. The separate pedestrian access is not provided through the area of open space fronting Main Road as originally proposed but it is proposed on the western side of the access road. 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.

- **Vehicle tracking –** the applicant has undertaken swept path analysis for an 8.1m fire tender and a 12m refuse vehicle. In certain locations the refuse vehicle appears to over run areas that are either landscaped or raised eg outside plot 41. The swept path plans should be reviewed and layout amended as necessary.

- **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 207 and 159 and plots 140 and 165. Consideration should be given to means of restricting vehicle speeds in these locations.

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