WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL **DATE: 24th July 2009**
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSULTATION

FROM: **Ian Gledhill** **TO:** **Adur District Council**
FAO: Peter Barnett

SUBJECT: **ADC/0250/09 - Redevelopment of car storage/sales site with 7 two-bedroom houses served by new access drive and parking area (outline application with all details reserved)**

42-44, Leconfield Road, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 9JB

CONSULTATION DATE: 8th July 2009

RECOMMENDATION:

Advice		**Modification**		**More Information**	
Objection		**No Objection**	X	**Refusal**	

TAD contribution: £5,926

This response comprises of the views of West Sussex County Council Local Development Division. The highways and infrastructure contribution requirements of this proposal have been considered and these views are incorporated within this response.

The site evidently has an existing, albeit redundant use. The permitted use is understood to be as a builders yard and it is noted that the application form implies a permitted B1c use. As little information has been given in regards of vehicle movements associated with the former uses, the infrastructure contributions have been calculated considering the indicated B1c use.

In terms of the proposed residential use, the site lies within a predominantly residential area and as such the principle of further development would be acceptable. The site has two existing vehicular accesses, located on the northern and southern boundaries of the site. The existing southern access is to be retained to provide a single access point to the proposed development, with the northerly point closed. Whilst there is some on-street parking to the north, this does not appear to significant interfere with visibility and given that there is an existing access, no safety issues would be anticipated with the continued usage. Pedestrian visibility splays are indicated, and it would appear that the splay on the southern side crosses 3rd party land as it enters into land forming part of no. 44. The boundary running along the southern side at present takes the form of a low fence, it wouldn't be envisaged that this treatment would change significant and hence adequate visibility should still be obtained.

The access drive is indicated as 3.1metres in width with a passing bay provided. The access drive is to be a shared surface, which would be an acceptable arrangement given the low vehicle speeds and flows. It is recommended that shared accesses are 4.5metres in width for the first 10metres to enable two opposing vehicles to pass clear of the public highway. The constraints of the site would appear to make this difficult to achieve and with due consideration of the likely low number of vehicle movements, the need for opposing vehicles to pass should not occur frequently. The passing bay does provide an option to allow two vehicles to pass close to the access, and this should be relocated closer to the access. It is also perhaps inevitable that the passing space will be used for the parking of cars, there is little that could be done to control this however.

7 car parking spaces are shown within the development. These appear to be primarily for use by plots 3,4,5,6 and 7 as the spaces are much more conveniently located for the use by these

plots rather than plots 1 and 2. Plots 1 and 2 would appear to have a nil parking provision and as such any demand from these would have to be accommodated on-street. The arrangement of the spaces would enable further non independent parking to be provided at the front of plots 6 and 7, although bays are not formally marked out in these regards. The 7 shown parking spaces if considered for use by 5 dwellings would be within the WSCC Parking Standards and no specific highway safety consequences would be anticipated as a consequence of the level of parking proposed.

A communal cycle store for a development of this nature may not be an appropriate solution. It would make more sense for individual stores to be provided for each dwelling. Details of the cycle parking facility should be secured via condition.

Contributions are required pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 to mitigate the impacts of the subject proposal in terms of demand on Highways and Sustainable Transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

Planning obligations requiring the above money is understood to accord with the Secretary of State's policy tests outlined by the in the *ODPM Circular 05/2005 Annex B*.

All TAD (Total Access Demand) contributions have been calculated in accordance with the stipulated local threshold and the methodology adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in November 2003.

The calculations have been derived on the basis of an increase in 7 Net dwellings

And

The calculations have been done on the basis of an increase in an additional 7 car parking spaces.

Please see below for a Breakdown and explanation of the WSCC Contribution Calculators. Also see the attached spreadsheet for the breakdown of the calculation figures. For further explanation please see the Sussex County Council website (http://www.westsussex.gov.uk/s106).

Deed of Planning Obligations

a) As a deed of planning obligations would be required to ensure payment of the necessary financial contribution, the County Council would require the proposed development to reimburse its reasonable legal fees incurred in the preparation of the deed.

b) The deed would provide for payment of the financial contribution upon commencement of the development.

c) In order to reflect the changing costs, the deed would include arrangements for review of the financial contributions at the date the payment is made if the relevant date falls after 31st March 2010.

d) Review of the contribution towards the provision of Transport and Sustainable Infrastructure should be by reference to an appropriate index, preferably RICS BCIS All-In TPI. This figure is subject to annual review.

Recent experience suggests that where a change in contributions required in relation to a development or the necessity for indexation of financial contributions from the proposed development towards the costs of providing service infrastructure is not specifically set out within recommendations approved by committee, applicants are unlikely to agree to such provisions being included in the deed itself. Therefore, it is important that your report and

recommendations should cover a possible change in requirements and the need for appropriate indexation arrangements in relation to financial contributions.

Please ensure that applicants and their agents are advised that any alteration to the housing mix, size, parking spaces, nature or tenure, may generate a different contribution requirement and thus require re-assessment of contributions. Such re-assessment should be sought as soon as the altered figures are 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.

Should you require further information in relation to the calculation of the contributions, please see additional information below.

In conclusion, subject to conditions recommended below and the above contribution, no objection would be raised to this proposal.

CONDITION
C8Biv
C9Kii (making reference to the closure of the existing northerly access)

Cycle parking
The dwellings, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until covered secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with a detailed construction plan to be submitted to and approved by the planning authority.
Reason – To provide alternative travel options to the use of the car in accordance with PPG 13.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

TAD- Total Access Demand

The methodology is based on total access to and from a development. An **Infrastructure Contribution** is required in respect of each occupant or employee provided with a parking space, as they would be more likely to use the road infrastructure. The **Sustainable Transport Contribution** is required in respect of each occupant or employee not provided with a parking space which would be likely to rely on sustainable transport.

TAD = Infrastructure contribution + Sustainable Transport contribution

a) Infrastructure Contribution
Contributions for Infrastructure are determined by the net increase in car parking spaces, multiplied by WSCC's estimated cost of providing transport infrastructure per vehicle- Infrastructure cost multiplier. The Infrastructure cost multiplier as at 2008/2009 is £800 per parking space.

Infrastructure contributions = Car parking spaces x Cost multiplier.

b) Sustainable Transport Contribution
This is derived from the net car parking increase subtracted from the projected increase in occupancy of the development. The sustainable transport contribution increases where the population is greater than the parking provided. The sustainable transport figure is then multiplied by County Council's estimated costs of providing sustainable transport infrastructure cost multiplier (£400).

Sustainable transport contr. = (net car parking – occupancy) x 400

Note: occupancy is determined by projected rates per dwelling and projected people per commercial floorspace as determined by WSCC calculation figures.

Ian Gledhill
Local Development