

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION**

DATE: 22nd January 2014

**FROM: Tim Townsend TO: Arun District Council
FAO: Cian Cronin**

SUBJECT: Y/99/13 - Outline application for 10.5 hectares of residential development (comprising up to 250 dwellings (30% to be affordable) together with ancillary open space and landscaping), 14.9 hectares of public open space development to be laid out as public parkland and landscaped green corridors, vehicular access from Ford Lane (The means of access) - This is a Departure from the Development Plan.

LOCATION: Land North & East Of St Marys Church, North End Road, Yapton, West Sussex

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 19th December 2013

RECOMMENDATION:

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

S106 contribution (see below for breakdown): £ final amount TBC

This is the second WSCC highways and transport response to the planning application and follows assessment of the application submission including Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.

Summary position of Highway Authority.

The application, as submitted, seeks in-principle approval to a residential scheme of up to 250 units on land found to the north of Yapton village. However, the Highway Authority is of the view that certain elements of the proposal such as access should be considered in detail as these are key elements of the development. As such, additional information is required to be submitted by the applicant to enable further assessment by the Highway Authority. This is documented below and summarised at the end of the main text of the report.

Site location.

The site is located approximately 800m north of Yapton Village centre. Currently agricultural land, it has two existing vehicular access points off Ford Lane. The land itself is bounded by Ford Lane to the north and (for a short distance) North End Road to the west. The site does not connect directly to any other roads, other than by Public Footpaths. As such, pedestrian access is currently achieved via a series of formal Public Rights of Way (PROW) that cross the site in several locations. These paths provide access to North Lane, Church Lane and to King George's Recreation Ground.

Yapton village and its immediate surrounds provide opportunities for shopping, employment, medical facilities and primary education. For greater choice, access to larger areas such as Littlehampton and Chichester would be required.

Public buses running nearby to the site are No.'s 66 and 700. The closest route 66 provides a service every 75 minutes and uses North End Road. Services run between Yapton and Bognor Regis calling at both Bognor Regis and Barnham railway stations. However, given its current

frequency, it does not necessarily fit in well with peak hour travel. By contrast, the 700 (Coastliner) generally provides a half-hourly service Monday-Saturday (hourly on Sunday), although the closest stops are found some 1200m south of the site. The 700 links Brighton to Portsmouth and calls at various railway stations along its route, including Littlehampton and Bognor Regis.

Nearest railway stations are Ford, Barnham and Littlehampton.

Proposed vehicular access.

Vehicular access is proposed off Ford Lane. Two access points are proposed with right hand turning lanes to assist with turning and traffic movements. These are as shown on drawings 130431-02 Revision 'A' and 130431-03 Revision 'A'. From scrutiny of the plans provided, it is clear that some visibility requirements have been shown but not all (forward visibility in particular but also in the case of the eastern access, actual major road/'y' distance). Therefore, the applicant needs to amend the plans to show this. Furthermore, traffic speed data is required to be collected by way of automatic traffic counter (ATC), to demonstrate that the visibility splays shown are suitable and based on the appropriate DMRB requirements. Dimensions of the right hand turning lane, its running lanes and footway are required as are swept-path diagrams showing the movements of vehicles (including HGVs) through the junctions and along Ford Lane. Consideration of the needs of cyclists must be shown.

Swept-path diagrams of a variety of vehicles (including HGVs) should be provided for the following:

- Junction of Ford Lane/North End Road (with proposed amendments); and,
- Site access points and right hand turning lanes.

Other access considerations.

Yapton railway crossing - A feasibility study is planned in early 2014 to look at potential solutions to resolve an ongoing rail level crossing issue at Yapton Lane. The developer should give consideration to the issues and potential highway alignments and accesses which might form part of this work alongside those proposed as part of this planning application.

Design Check.

As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, further information about the access and right hand turning lanes is required (geometry, sight lines, widths etc.). Given that the designs should be prepared in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), a formal Design Check should be undertaken as per WSCC policy. This should clearly state what sections of DMRB have been used; document any Departures from Standard (DfS); state the designer's name and qualifications and provide a clear drawing number. Full details of WSCC processes can be found on the WSCC website.

Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response.

A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) accompanies the planning application. This appears to have assessed the road safety aspects of the new vehicular accesses onto Ford Lane and changes to North End Road in proximity of Church Lane. Although stated in the TA as being submitted at the reserved matters stage, the Highway Authority considers that the pedestrian/cycle/emergency entrance onto North End Road should also be Safety Audited at this stage. Given that the location of this latter access appears fixed and that it is principal to the development, it is not unreasonable to ask for this now to check that no insurmountable issues arise at this early stage of development.

Furthermore, the junction of Ford Lane with North End Road (including consideration of the proposed bus shelter shown on the western side of the road opposite the junction) should also be Safety Audited.

With regard to the Designer's Response, the name of the designer should be clearly printed alongside his/her signature. Turning to the actual responses, the Highway Authority is not satisfied with the replies to the following problem references found in the RSA:

- 3.6 – The reply suggests that no changes/amendments to the bank will be necessary. The designer should provide further explanation about this after the speed surveys and, in turn, the accesses have been reviewed.
- 3.7 – Designer to provide a plan (at this stage) showing visibility and confirming that vegetation will be cut back as per the RSA recommendation.
- 3.9 – Further work is required in respect of changes to the bus stop and shelter locations and how pedestrians will access them.
- 3.10 – Revised drawings referred to not attached to Designer's Response – please provide.

Personal injury accident report.

Personal injury accident reports have been obtained by the applicant and are supplied within the TA. However, only a three year time period appears to have been used. Also, the title of the report refers specifically to Burndell Road although it is observed that the geographical scope of the report may cover Ford Lane and other roads surrounding the site. As this is not clear and to address the five year requirement of WSCC, the applicant should provide clarification and a further report and submit this to the Local Planning and Highway Authorities for examination.

Traffic Assessment.

This is set out in sections 5.0 and 6.0 of the Transport Assessment (TA) provided by Motion transport planning consultants. The TA has assessed a number of junctions on the surrounding road network. TRICS data is also put forward providing an assessment of likely traffic generated by the development.

Trip rates – Trip rates are stated in Table 5.4, based on an average of other committed developments in the locality (0.584 AM peak and 0.652 PM peak with daily quoted as 5.360). These are accepted by the Highway Authority. A slight discrepancy is found for the total AM peak for 75 affordable dwellings in Table 5.2. The consultant quotes 38 as being the AM total whereas applying the trip rate of 0.584, the figure rises slightly to 44. The figure quoted in Table 5.3, do however, total correctly using the trip rates put forward by the applicant.

Traffic impact – Tables 5.1-5.3 set out the applicant's assessment of the likely traffic generation based on a split of 75 affordable and 175 privately owned dwellings. Based on the trip rates quoted in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, Table 5.3 then sets out the possible traffic impact in actual numbers. This is summarised below:

Time period	Arrivals	Departures	Total
Weekday AM – 07:45-08:45	42	104	146
Weekday PM – 16:45-17:45	100	63	163
Daily – 07:00-19:00	658	682	1,340

Peak periods have been stated as being 07:45-08:45 (AM) and 16:45-17:45 (PM) based on the Manual Traffic Count (MTC) data provided by the applicant.

Traffic distribution (likely routes development-related traffic is likely to follow) is shown in Table 5.6 of the TA. This is summarised below:

Junction	Morning peak	Evening peak
A27/Yapton Lane	34	46
Yapton Lane/The Street	34	46
Yapton Lane/Lake Lane	40	52
North End Road/Ford Lane/Maypole Lane	85	102
Ford Lane/Station Road	61	60
North End Lane/Church Lane	45	50
North End Road/Yapton Road/Main Road	45	50
Main Road/Church Lane	39	43
Main Road/Burndell Road/Bilsham Road	39	43
Western site access/Ford Lane	115	132
Eastern site access/Ford Lane	104	111

As set out, it is difficult to interpret the figures with some trips appearing to be 'lost' along certain links (in particular Ford Lane). Whilst some trips would dissipate as they progress through a series of junctions, it is also unclear how the figures (particularly at the western site access/Ford Lane and eastern site access/Ford Lane) have been arrived at. As such, the applicant is required to provide further information and to explain the figures and distributions in more detail.

With regard to additional modelling, additional peak hour impact brought about by the development should also be demonstrated by way of sensitivity testing at the following locations and the outputs sent to the Highway Authority to consider:

- Climping Roundabout,
- Oyster Catcher junction, and;
- Comet Corner.

Effects on nearby railway crossings – Station Road (Ford) and North End Road (Yapton).

Insufficient information is provided by the applicant to show the impact on the two nearby railway crossings at Yapton and Ford brought about by the development. As such, detailed surveys should be undertaken by the applicant to demonstrate how the traffic from this development would impact on both Yapton and Ford railway crossings. Surveys should use the same format used by Motion Transport Planning for the 'Woodgate Centre' Appeal proposals but also include the impact of the proposed development. They should be carried out for at least two days in a normal week. Mondays and Fridays should be avoided. Surveys in school holiday times would not be acceptable. Consideration should also be given to nearby non-vehicular crossings.

The LPA should ensure that they consult Network Rail given the site's proximity and likely impacts on both Yapton and Ford railway crossings and other nearby non-vehicular crossings over the railway line.

Access by non-car modes.

Given the size of the site, a Non-Motorised User Report should be submitted for all roads in proximity of the site showing clearly the routes non-motorised users will be able to use. Suitability of routes and widths should also be documented. However, turning specifically to what has been submitted so far the following comments are made:

Walking – Plans show a new footway created along the southern side of Ford Lane connecting both access points back to North End Road. The width of this is not shown. A minimum dimension of 2.0m is required. Plans also suggest that an internal hierarchy of walking routes will be provided, some of which utilising improved PROW routes within the site and connecting to existing paths off-site. This will be necessary to maximise sustainable access choice and improve access to a regular bus service – i.e. route 700 Coastliner. A route to that approved under Y/81/10 would also be beneficial. The width of the footway running on the eastern side of North End Road between Ford Lane and Orchard Business Park should also be reviewed and improvements considered where highway or development land permits.

Cycling – An indicative route is shown on application drawing 102C. This will be considered further at any reserved matters stage. However, the site will also be expected to provide further links north-south through the site connecting to routes providing access to Main Road and Burndell Road. Parts of these could be accommodated on quiet roads within the scheme. However, the preference would be for a more formalised network of high quality routes away from access roads leading through the site from Ford Lane and North End Road and then towards Church Lane, with connections to King George Recreation Ground and through to Main Road and Burndell Road. Links should also be provided through the eastern part of the site and through to King George Recreation Ground (annotated as ‘St. Mary’s Park’ on one of the application drawings). A link through to that approved under Y/81/10 would also be beneficial. All changes and/or connections to formal PROW will have to be approved by the PROW officer and, where required, the PROW Committee.

Public transport – Routes 66 and 700 are the closest to the site. The former calls at North End Road and the latter on Main Road. The 66 provides an infrequent service of about 1 every 75 minutes between Bognor Regis and Yapton. It calls at Bognor Regis and Barnham railway station on parts of its route. The 700 ‘Coastliner’ generally provides a half-hourly service Monday to Saturday (hourly on Sunday) between Brighton and Portsmouth, calling at numerous towns, villages and bus and rail stations and provides a far more regular service than the 66. However, it is located some 1200m from the site with (currently) limited connections to bus stops on-foot. Improved access to routes providing connections to the 700 is, therefore, required.

New bus shelters and stops are proposed on North End Road. However, the location of both should be reviewed for the following reasons:

The one shown adjacent to Maypole Lane would obstruct visibility at the road junction by the presence of the shelter and people waiting. There is also concern that with a bus waiting on the northbound carriageway of North End Road, drivers turning left from Ford Lane to travel southwards along North End Road may be faced with vehicles overtaking the stationary bus. As such, the location of the northbound stop and waiting facilities should be reviewed.

The stop on the southbound carriageway also needs to demonstrate that visibility is not compromised and links well with the site access onto North End Road. The needs of pedestrians and cyclists also must be carefully considered at any location, particularly if any revised shelter and stop position for northbound traffic is located close to it.

Consideration of improvements at the next set of stops close to Church Lane and the school should also be given.

Public Rights of Way (PROW).

PROW routes 357, 358, 359 and 363 run across the site. PROW routes 355 and 356 are found to the north of Ford Lane. PROW routes 360 and 360/1 run past and cross King George Playing Field respectively. To promote use, ideally all routes should be upgraded to dual-use (pedestrians and cyclists) with improved width and surfacing in accordance with WSCC PROW criteria. The details of which can follow at any reserved matters stage. However, as well as utilising any

existing routes, a route from the top of the site through the eastern side of the site connecting to King George Recreation Ground would be sought. Any diversions of the routes (including any temporary diversions) will require a Diversion Order to be obtained from the Local Planning Authority who would need to process and seek to make any such Order under S257 of the Town and Country Planning Act. WSCC would be consulted at this stage. It is important that all paths referred to in the application submission are upgraded to provide for the best quality links through the site and to and from the centre of the village. Furthermore, improved links will ensure that access to a frequent bus service (i.e. the 700) can be achieved in the best possible way. The existing steps at the north of the site on PROW 357 should be removed and replaced with an alternative pedestrian and cycle-friendly facility to ensure that improved access for all is achieved at this point. Also, the link from the site to Church Lane should also be improved in terms of width and surfacing.

Plan 102C provides annotation stating that Church Lane will be improved as part of the planning application. No detail is shown. As such, more information should be provided.

Travel Plan.

A Framework Travel Plan has been submitted as part of the planning application. Section 7.0 of the FTP sets out some of the measures that would be included in a final version. However, at this stage commitment to electric car charging points and penalty measures (if targets are not met) should also be included in the Framework Travel Plan. When this has been agreed, a condition can secure this as part of any outline planning consent. Further detailed points can be picked up at the detailed design/reserved matters stage.

Street lighting.

As part of the proposals, additional street lighting will be necessary on Ford Lane in and around the new access points and proposed footway. Improvements to existing street lighting (or replacement by new) at the junction of Ford Lane and North End Road will also be required. The details of this can be dealt with at any detailed design stage. All to be provided at the applicant's expense.

Fire and Rescue Service (water and access).

Viewing the proposal, it appears that the major development is in two groups fronting Ford Lane with an emergency access into North End Road. From the impact of increase in housing, the Fire and Rescue Service would have to accommodate the resilience to cope with the increased demand. With regards to access, provided building regulations are complied with, no objections would be made. The Service will require additional hydrants attached to a mains network for the purposes of fire fighting (numbers and positions to be established when full plans are submitted at any reserved matters stage).

WSCC infrastructure contributions.

The development will be expected to provide contributions towards WSCC infrastructure. A summary of some of this is provided at the foot of this report based on standard accepted formulae and terminology. Contributions towards off-site highway works/schemes is to be agreed depending on the outcomes of the transport modelling and through discussion with the applicant and/or his agents.

Conclusion.

Additional information is required to enable further assessment of the planning application from a highway point of view. Full details are provided in the main text of this report. However, a summary of the points is set out below:

1. Road Safety Audit of junction of North End Road with Ford Lane.
2. Road Safety Audit of junction of North End Road where pedestrian/cycle connection emerges.

3. Sensitivity modelling of A259 Worms Lane/Grevatt's Lane/ B2132 Bilsham Road (Comet Corner) junction; A259 Grevatt's Lane/Crookthorn Lane/ B2233 Yapton Road junction; A259 Crookthorne Lane/Church Lane (Climping roundabout) junction.
4. Further clarification of data in Table 5.6 of the TA.
5. Consideration of access proposals alongside feasibility study work for possible by-passing of Yapton railway crossing.
6. Further detailed surveys of Yapton and Ford railway crossings (and nearby non-vehicular railway crossings) and the impacts brought about by the proposed development on them.
7. Review of revised bus stop and shelter locations (and review of further improvements to facilities further south along North End Road).
8. Clarification about improvements to Church Lane.
9. Swept-path analysis at site accesses and junction of North End Road/Ford Lane.
10. Visibility requirements at site accesses.
11. ATC speed survey data.
12. 5 years of accident records for surveyed area.
13. Design checks of proposed access works.
14. Travel Plan amendments.
15. Plan showing extended footway along south side of Ford Lane.
16. Further information regarding improved footpath and cycleway links through to and across King George Recreation Ground to be provided.

Please re-consult when additional information is made available.

Thank you.

Tim Townsend
Strategic Planning

**WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT DIVISION: SECTION 106 CONSULTATION RESPONSE
(excluding Transport (known as TAD) contributions)**

DATE: 2nd January 2013

FROM: Adam Charlton, Monitoring and Records Team

TO: Tim Townsend, Planning Applications Team

DISTRICT COUNCIL: Arun

Application Number: Y/99/13

The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to: Land North & East Of St Marys Church, North End Road, Yapton, West Sussex

Planning Application details – Outline application for 10.5 hectares of residential development (comprising up to 250 dwellings (30% to be affordable) together with ancillary open space and landscaping), 14.9 hectares of public open space development to be laid out as public parkland and landscaped green corridors, vehicular access from Ford Lane (The means of access) - This is a Departure from the Development Plan.

Without prejudice to the informal representations of the County Council in respect of the above planning proposal, I am writing to advise you as to the likely requirements for contributions towards the provision of additional County Council service infrastructure, other than highways and public transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

The basis for my advice is contained in the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document "The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1.

The planning obligation formulae below are understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined by the in the *National Planning Policy Framework, 2012*.

The advice is as follows:

1. School Infrastructure Contribution

- 1.1 The Director for Children and Young People's Services advises that it appears that at present primary schools within the catchment area of the proposal currently would not have spare capacity and would not be able to accommodate the children generated by the assumed potential residential development from this proposal. Accordingly, contributions would need to be requested. However, the situation will be monitored and further advice on all of the main education sectors, (i.e. Primary/Secondary/Further Secondary) should be sought if this planning application is to be progressed.

1.2 Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development, reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings (by which we mean Social Rented dwellings, but NOT Shared Equity, Intermediate or Key Worker status dwellings) for occupation by persons already residing in the education catchment area; the County Council's adopted floorspace standard for education provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional education floorspace. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal Agreement in order that the

school infrastructure contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the School Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

DfE Figure x ACP = School Infrastructure Contribution where:

Note: x = multiplied by.

ACP (Additional Child Product) = The estimated additional number of school age children likely to be generated by the development calculated by reference to the total number of dwellings, less any allowance for affordable dwellings, as approved by a subsequent reserve matters planning application. The following criteria are used to generate a child product:

Dwelling Size		Occupancy	
		House	Flat
1 bed	=	1.7	1.2
2 bed	=	1.8	1.3
3 bed	=	2.2	1.7
4 bed	=	2.7	2.4
5 bed	=	3.0	2.0

Using the above occupancy rates to determine an overall population increase the following factors are applied. According to 2001 census data, there are 14 persons per 1000 population in each school year group for houses and 5 persons per 1000 population in each school year group for flats. There are 7 year groups for primary (years R to 6) and 5 for secondary (years 7 to 11). For Sixth Form, a factor of 0.54 is applied to the Child Product figure as this is the average percentage of year 11 school leavers who continue into Sixth Form colleges in West Sussex.

DfE Figure = Department for Children, Schools and Families (DfE) Primary school building costs per pupil place (for pupils aged 4 to 11) as adjusted for the West Sussex area applicable at the date when the School Infrastructure Contribution is paid (which currently for the financial year 2013/2014 are – Primary £13,416, Secondary £20,215, Further Secondary £21,924), updated as necessary by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors Building Cost Information Service All-In Tender Price Index.

2. Library Infrastructure Contribution

- 2.1 The County Librarian advises that the proposed development would be within the area served by Littlehampton Library and that the library would not currently be able to adequately serve the additional needs that the development would generate.

However, a scheme is approved to provide additional floorspace at the library. In the circumstances, a financial contribution towards the approved scheme would be required in respect of the extra demands for library services that would be generated by the proposed development.

2.2 Financial Contribution

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development, reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings (by which we mean Social Rented dwellings,

but NOT Shared Equity, Intermediate or Key Worker status dwellings) for occupation by persons already residing in the library's catchment area; the County Council's adopted floorspace standard for library provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional library floorspace. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal Agreement in order that the library contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the Libraries Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

$L \times AP$ = Libraries Infrastructure Contribution where:

Note: x = multiplied by.

AP (Additional Persons) = The estimated number of additional persons generated by the development calculated by reference to the total number of dwellings, less any allowance for affordable dwellings, as approved by a subsequent reserve matters planning application. The following figures are given as a guideline:

Dwelling Size		Occupancy	
		House	Flat
1 bed	=	1.7	1.2
2 bed	=	1.8	1.3
3 bed	=	2.2	1.7
4 bed	=	2.7	2.4
5 bed	=	3.0	2.0

L = Extra library space in sqm. per 1,000 population x the library cost multiplier (which currently for the financial year 2013/2014 are 30sq.m and £3,930 per sqm respectively).

3. Fire & Rescue Service Infrastructure

3.1 The County Fire Officer advises that the developer should install fire hydrants connected to a suitable main for the purpose of fire fighting **at his own expense** in positions agreed between the Fire and Rescue Service and the Water Authority. Hydrants should be installed, tested and operational as each phase is available for occupation. The development should also include suitable access for fire brigade vehicles and equipment. For further information please contact: David Boarer – Fire & Rescue Services Tel: 01243 813667).

3.2 Fire Stations

The County Fire Officer advises that a financial contribution from the proposed development towards the cost of fire and rescue infrastructure, principally fire stations and services serving the area within which the proposal stands, would be required. This is necessary due to proposed development in the Southern division and the resultant need to improve service provision across the area. The proposed development should proportionately contribute towards the cost of necessary infrastructure needed to support development.

3.3 Financial Contribution (excluding provision of fire hydrants)

The financial contribution sought by the County Council would be based on: the estimated additional population that would be generated by the proposed development,

reduced to reflect any affordable dwellings (by which we mean Social Rented dwellings, but NOT Shared Equity, Intermediate or Key Worker status dwellings) for occupation by persons already residing in the fire service provision area; the County Council's adopted standards of fire service cover provision; and the estimated costs of providing additional fire stations. As the housing mix is not known at this stage, I propose the insertion of a formula into any legal Agreement in order that the fire service contribution may be calculated at a later date. The formula should read as follows:

The Owner and the Developer covenant with the County Council that upon Commencement of Development the Owner and/or the Developer shall pay to the County Council the Fire and Rescue Infrastructure Contribution as calculated by the County Council in accordance with the following formula:-

$Y \times (Z / M)$ = Fire and Rescue Infrastructure Contribution where:

Note: / = divided by, x = multiplied by.

Y = The estimated adjusted increase in population generated by the development using the following figures as a guideline:

Dwelling Size		Occupancy	
		House	Flat
1 bed	=	1.7	1.2
2 bed	=	1.8	1.3
3 bed	=	2.2	1.7
4 bed	=	2.7	2.4
5 bed	=	3.0	2.0

Z = the estimated costs of providing additional Fire and Rescue Infrastructure in the Southern Service Division of West Sussex at the time of payment (which, for information, for 2007/2008 was £5,530,000).

M = the projected population of the Fire and Rescue Service Southern Service Division of West Sussex in 2016 at the time of payment (which, for information, for the 2007/2008 financial year was 429,647).

General points

Please ensure that the applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, either size, nature or tenure, may generate a different population and require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the housing mix is known and not be left until signing of the section 106 Agreement is imminent.

It should be noted that the figures quoted in this letter are based on current information and will be adhered to for 3 months. Thereafter, if they are not consolidated in a signed S106 agreement they will be subject to revision as necessary to reflect the latest information as to cost and need.

Review of the contribution towards the provision of additional County Council services should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Should you require further general information or assistance in relation to the requirements for contributions towards the provision of County Council service

infrastructure please contact, in the first instance, the Planning Applications Team officer, named above.

Where the developer intends to keep some of the estate roads private we will require provisions in any s106 agreement to ensure that they are properly built, never offered for adoption and that a certificate from a suitably qualified professional is provided confirming their construction standard.

Where land is to be transferred to the County Council as part of the development (e.g. a school site) that we will require the developer to provide CAD drawings of the site to aid design/layout and to ensure that there is no accidental encroachment by either the developer or ourselves.

cc: Deborah Lewis, WSCC Library Services (via email),
Tracey Dunn, WSCC Children and Young People's Services (via email),
David Boarer, WSCC Fire Services (via email),