WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL **DATE: 10/05/2012**
STRATEGIC PLANNING CONSULTATION

FROM: Keith Comins / Ian Hayward **TO: Adur & Worthing Councils**
FAO: Carlos Hone

SUBJECT: AWDM/0515/12 - Retro application for new front boundary wall up to 2.3mtrs high and new porch.

115, Grinstead Lane, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 9DR

CONSULTATION DATE: 27/04/2012

RECOMMENDATION:

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

S106 contribution: £n/a

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments. A site visit was conducted on 09/05/2012.

This application seeks retrospective planning consent for a front boundary wall and gates that have been erected adjacent to the highway on Grinstead Lane, Lancing. Grinstead Lane is an 'A' classified road subject to a 30 mph speed restriction at this point. The lane is a significant carrier of vehicular movements and acts as a link road between the A27 in the north and the A259 coast road to the south. Grinstead Lane is the main route of access into Lancing from both of these 'A' classified roads. A footway which abuts the erected wall is present along Grinstead Lane, this footway also denotes the extent of adopted highway at this location.

At the time of our site visit it was observed that the gates were open and they did so inwards of the site. A gate set back distance of 5 metres is the standard used for gates fronting the highway servicing residential properties. This is so that a vehicle can be fully removed form the highway while the gates are opened. A gate set back distance of 5 metres has not been incorporated into the design of the gates at 115 Grinstead Lane; however it was observed on site that other properties, particularly to the north of the site, do have gates with a similar set back distance. It would be assumed in this instance that when a vehicle leaves the site the gates are left open to allow for safe and convenient access on return to the site. There would be occasions such as holidays or extended periods away from the dwelling, when the gates would be closed on exiting the site for security purposes. As these occasions would be considered infrequent and taking into consideration that other accesses appear to be operating safety with gates, no overriding concerns would be raised to the gates themselves.

WSCC as the Highways Authority does however have an objection to the overall size of the wall and piers which we consider to have a detrimental impact towards pedestrian visibility. Pedestrian visibility is necessary where a footway runs along the frontage of a development that incorporates a point of access, particularly where there is expected to be a high level of pedestrian movement. As Grinstead Lane is an 'A' classified road, we would expect this to be the case. Therefore, pedestrian visibility spays should be incorporated by ensuring adjacent site boundaries remain free of obstruction in excess of 0.6 metres or an appropriate height which is in keeping with neighbouring dwellings with a similar access arrangement. From observations made on site I would suggest the height of the wall without the current piers would satisfy this requirement.

Ian Hayward
Strategic Planning