

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATION**

DATE: 06/01/2010

**FROM: Jamie Brown TO: Arun District Council
FAO: S. Leeson**

SUBJECT: Y/85/09-Replacement dwelling (Departure from the Development Plan).

The Brickfield, Hoe Lane, Flansham, PO22 8NW

CONSULTATION DATE: 07/12/2009

RECOMMENDATION:

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

S106 contribution: £N/A

The Highway aspect of 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.

West Sussex County Council has been consulted on this application and considers issues of highway safety, capacity and archaeology.

Highways

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.

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

The proposed dwelling is to replace the existing dwelling. Whilst the proposal may result in minor alterations to the proposed car parking and on-site turning, the access onto the public highway is to remain as it is. In terms of vehicular movements, the proposed dwelling is unlikely to result in any material increase or any detrimental impact. Providing the proposed car parking does not exceed the WSCC Maximum Standards, no highway concerns would be raised.

Archaeology

The application site is 100 metres west of the location where a Bronze Age founder's hoard was discovered in the 1930s when a driveway was created for Rilbrook House. To the south the archaeological evaluation of the Felpham Site 6 housing land has demonstrated that there is widespread evidence for prehistoric settlement in this vicinity.

However, the historic map evidence (and the place-name/ house name) points to the fact that the application site was formerly a brickfield and therefore the brickearth which would have contained any archaeological features is likely to have been disturbed if not fully excavated below the limit to which features would have been dug.

In the circumstances I do not consider that a requirement by condition for archaeological recording/ monitoring is necessary.

Jamie Brown
Local Development