

## WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>TO:</b>                 | Horsham District Council<br>FAO:Stephanie Bryant   |
| <b>FROM:</b>               | WSCC – Highways Authority  |
| <b>DATE:</b>               | 5 March 2025   |
| <b>LOCATION:</b>           | New Place Nurseries<br>London Road<br>Pulborough<br>West Sussex<br>RH20 1AT  |
| <b>SUBJECT:</b>            | DC/24/1676<br>Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline Planning Consent DC/21/2321, as varied by application DC/24/1204. The Reserved Matters comprise details of 160 no dwellings, associated internal access roads, parking and landscaping for areas east of the right of way. Details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be considered. |
| <b>DATE OF SITE VISIT:</b> | n/a  |
| <b>RECOMMENDATION:</b>     | Modification   |

### Reserved Matters Application DC/24/1676

WSCC as the County Highway Authority has considered the documents submitted as part of this reserved matters planning application (DC/1676/24), at New Place Nurseries for 160 dwellings.

The following documents have been reviewed:

1. Landscape Masterplan (24.1874.L001)
2. Combined hard and soft landscaping plan 1-8 (24.1874 L101-8)
3. Design and Access Statement
4. Site Layout Plan 8000 Rev P02
5. Fire Appliance Tracking 8001 Rev P02
6. Refuse Vehicle Tracking 8004 Rev P03
7. Bin and Cycle Store Plans and elevations (24.1874.4900)
8. Parking Layout Plan

WSCC have considered inclusive mobility guidance and manual for streets regarding the desire lines and permeability of the site.

The site provides good links as there are already PROW which run through the site. WSCC has reviewed the site plan and have highlighted in the plan below where we would recommend further consideration over how people will move within the site and where additional links could be made to support perceived desire lines and encourage even more permeable routes through the site.

#### **1. Desire lines**



## 2. Road Hierarchy

It's not mentioned in the design and access statement however it seems there are three road types.

**Primary access road** - with footway on both sides, tree lined, and houses set back from the road in an arcadian style. Materials used are tarmac.

**Secondary access road** - have a footway on one side and materials used are also tarmac, where the footway meets a shared surface design the footway drops the pedestrian into the shared area.

**Shared access drives** - serving no more than 6 dwellings are in a contrasting material of block paving and where access drives meet with a driveway access a different contrasting block paving is also used.

**Trees** - what type of trees will these be? Mfs 11.3.4 Trees and shrubs should not obstruct pedestrian sightlines. In general, driver sightlines also need to be maintained, although vegetation can be used to limit excessive forward visibility to limit traffic speeds. Slow growing species with narrow trunks and canopies above 2 m should be considered. Vegetation should not encroach onto the carriageways or footways.

## 3. Road and footway widths

These appear to be in line with Manual for streets guidance of a 5.5m primary and secondary road, and 4.1m access driveway.

4. Footways are 2m, with two footways provided either side of the primary road, and only on one side on secondary roads, and none on access driveways.
5. Informal paths in contrasting material are also provided linking the site and these are also 2m wide.
6. The design is landscape led and the use of trees to soften the use of hard landscaping materials is welcomed.
7. Turning heads are provided for, and swept path diagrams show that a refuse/emergency vehicle is able to access all areas of the proposed site as per plans Fire Appliance Tracking 8001 Rev P02 & Refuse Vehicle Tracking 8004 Rev P03

- 8.** If the site is to be offered for adoption where there are cul-de-sac/access drives with under 6 dwellings these would not be adopted. These access drives provide access to between 3-5 dwellings and do not provide any footways.
- 9.** If offered for adoption the secondary roads would require footways on both sides where there are access points into dwellings. It would seem that some of the secondary roads which serve no more than 5 or 6 dwellings may be better designed as shared surface spaces.
- 10.** Service margins of a minimum of 1/2 a meter on one side will need to be included to ensure access to utilities and services can be undertaken whilst keeping the road open for access.
- 11.** Will the change in surfacing in the centre of the site be raised at all? This is acceptable as a feature to slow traffic. WSCC would only raise issue with this if the route has the potential to be a bus route now or in the future as raised tables are not suitable for bus routes.
- 12.** The raised table is shown in a contrasting material to highlight the difference here.
- 13.** Forward Visibility has not been shown within the internal roads, especially in cul-de-sac locations are corner plots set back enough to allow for forward visibility around bends for the design speed.
- 14.** There is a road coming off the temporary turning head at the end of the primary access road. This appears to lead to a suds feature but its got clear what this is meant to link to?

### **15. Footways**

Footways on the main primary access road seem to be designed to give pedestrians priority which is welcomed however it is not clear at access roads with footways if these will be created as junctions with dropped kerbs and tactile paving or raised to meet the pedestrian desire line.

- 16.** Tactile paving and dropped kerb locations need to be considered to help the elderly and young, immobile or impartially sited navigate the layout in areas where there are footways on one side but not on the other. See plan below indicating areas in pink where pedestrians may need to cross to gain access to footways.



**17.** The applicant also needs to consider how mobility impaired pedestrians can crossover the primary access road to gain access to the footway on both sides. Currently there does not seem to be any alternative than to use the driveway access points to crossover and these only seem to favour pedestrians who can see where these access point are. WSCC think there should be provision for this in the design.

**18.** In the northeast corner of the site there is a set of steps linking this part of the site to the existing PROW. WSCC would recommend a ramp here in addition or if there is not enough space to replace the steps, to enable use by all.

#### **19. Footbridge over the railway**

WSCC note the site is well connected to the PROW network and PROW 2330 provides access from the site over the railway crossing. Are there any plans to upgrade this to a footbridge linking areas north and south of the railway line which would provide access to the local Sainsbury supermarket.

#### **20. Parking**

286 allocated parking spaces are provided which is line with the WSCC car parking calculator. 31 visitor spaces are provided, 72 unallocated and 95 garage spaces. This has been checked with the

**21.** Blocks of parking are noticeable in north west corner and additional tree planting or vegetation has been used here to break up the parking layout, including in the parking courtyard to soften these areas in keeping with the landscape led design.

**22.** Parking space dimensions are in line with WSCC car parking guidance to be at least 2.4m x 4.8m.

**23.**However, Manual for streets guidance also includes the requirement for the site to provide at least 5% of all spaces to be larger dimensions to be useable by a disabled person, please show where these are located.

**24.Visitor parking**

WSCC guidance suggests "*it may be appropriate to allow for additional demand for Visitor parking of 0.2/spaces per dwelling*" (DCLG, 2007, *Residential Car Parking Research*).

This equates to 31 visitor spaces. WSCC has noticed these are not spread out evenly across the site. The majority of spaces are provided for at the pump track and at the very beginning of the site by plots 1-5. WSCC would recommend the visitor spaces are more evenly distributed taking into account area of the site where road widths are narrower and may not be able to accommodate visitor parking as well.

**25.Pump Track Parking**

We would also suggest the pump track provides some spaces independent of these visitor spaces as it is not a residential use.

**Alison Meeus**

**West Sussex County Council – Planning Services**