

Highways Development Management

Shire Hall
Gloucester
GL1 2TH

David Lowin
Stroud District Council
Council Offices
Ebley Mill
Stroud
Gloucestershire
GL5 4UB

email: lucas.arinze@gloucestershire.gov.uk

Please ask for: Lucas Arinze

Our Ref: S/2018/041686

Your Ref: S.18/2326/REM

Date: 24 January 2019

Dear David Lowin,

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 HIGHWAY RECOMMENDATION

LOCATION: Parcel H11 & H12 Land West Of Stonehouse Grove Lane Westend Stonehouse Gloucestershire

PROPOSED: Approval of reserved matters following permission S.14/0810/OUT. Development comprising the erection of 165 dwellings and associated landscaping, access, parking and infrastructure

Introduction:

An outline application (Ref. S.14/0810/OUT) for A mixed use development comprising up to 1,350 dwellings and 9.3 hectares of employment land for use classes B1, B2 and B8; a mixed use local centre comprising use classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1, D2 and B1; primary school, open space and landscaping, parking and supporting infrastructure and utilities; and the creation of new vehicular accesses from Grove Lane, Oldends Lane and Brunel Way was approved on 14th April 2016.

This review relates to the approval of reserved matters comprising: access, appearance, landscaping layout and scale detail for the erection of 165 dwellings with parking and infrastructure.

Initially clarification is sought for the approval of reserved matters, if different from the above. The application form relates to the approval of reserved matters comprising: access, appearance, landscaping layout and scale however the Design and Access Statement (DAS) states that 'the planning

application refers to all matters except access, for which details have been approved in the Outline Planning Permission.'

Scope:

The purpose of this review is to appraise the application from a highways perspective. A technical review has been completed of all relevant submitted documents to demonstrate accordance with local and national guidance, including Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (MfGS) and Manual for Streets (MfS).

Access:

Subject to the above being clarified and access being a reserved matter for consideration clarification is required regard the distance of the two junctions located within close proximity to the roundabout junction with adjacent landscaping. Junctions should be located no closer than 20m to the main junctions, should be safe and suitable and should also minimise the scope for conflicts, in accordance with the guidance contained within Manual for Streets Figure 8.19 and the NPPF.

Road Layout:

The DAS and illustrative layout plan submitted as part of the approved outline application have been reviewed in order to understand the key design principles adopted for the internal site layout and to determine the extent to which the reserved matters application complies with these documents.

To align with the guidance set out in both MfGS and MfS and the DAS the design parameters of the layout should provide a connected network of pedestrian and cycle friendly streets that provide safe movement for all users. Whilst this has been executed in areas of the layout there remains areas where pedestrians and cyclists haven't necessary been given priority first due to the design.

The DAS states that it recognises pedestrian desire lines and allows for safe pedestrian and cycle movement through the site in order to reduce the dependency on the car as well as pedestrian prioritised streets and traffic calming measures being proposed along the secondary street to provide a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists, however parts of the layout remain contrary to this.

Areas of the layout have provided the provision of pedestrian prioritised streets, consisting of a 5.5m carriageway with 1.8m footpath on one side with the aim of providing a safer environment for pedestrians. However, pedestrians accessing plots 289-290 for example will have to step out into the carriageway to access the dwellings as a lack of pedestrian segregation has been provided.

In addition clarification is sought as to how access can be safely gained to plots 245-247, the proposed layout demonstrates to access these plots all users are expected to pass over grass verge.

Primary and secondary streets should be considered as continuous routes that permeate through the development; with the guiding principle being that vehicles should not be required to perform a U-turn. Cul-de-sacs should provide access to a small number of dwellings, provide turning facilities and occupy

the margins of the development. Although a cul-de-sac arrangement will be supported connectivity between development parcels is preferred.

Details of all carriageway and footway/cycleways widths and junction radii will need to be annotated on plan, together with annotations to denote any changes in width. Widths need to be appropriate to accommodate the expected vehicle movements and pedestrian/cycle flows.

The proposed layout shows fairly straight carriageway alignments which could result in excessive vehicle speeds through the development. Pedestrian and cycle routes through the development are convoluted due to the block structure, which creates the impression of a car-centric development. Furthermore, provision should be made for a more fluent dedicated shared pedestrian / cycle link to the external network as previously agreed with the LPA. As cycle facilities were removed from the spine road, it was proposed and supported by the LPA that a clearly defined, legible off-carriageway route should be provided through all parcels that would run broadly following the route of the spine road. Such routes are of great importance for this development and what was proposed and agreed tries to limit the impact on developable land whilst ensuring that a route on the likely desire lines to key residential, employment land parcels and leisure/retail facilities is provided and accessible for all users. This was supported as a way of safely integrating the development with the wider area.

Traffic calming and speed reduction can be achieved through good design and should not necessitate specific measures such as changes in road surface and road narrowing. Revised plans should make use of bends in the alignment of streets to slow vehicles and restrict forward visibility and therefore manage vehicle speeds. It should however be demonstrable that the minimum required level of visibility can be achieved in accordance with the target desire speed (target design speed to be clarified). The planning layout appears to show some type of tables; however I am unsure if these are raised. It will need to be ensured that the traffic calming offers vertical deflection to control vehicle speeds. An annotated plan showing that the required levels of emerging and forward visibility throughout the layout can be achieved will need to be submitted.

Signing and lining or buildouts or similar will be required to the west of the site as it is not clear to drivers when approaching junctions as to where the major flow is to/from the side road with the result that drivers may not 'give way' due to the lack of traffic. Priority should remain with the main arm carrying the higher flows.

Shared Space:

Following the correspondence received from The Department for Transport (DfT) last year, where shared surface is proposed the following criteria will apply:

- Shared surface will only be accepted in culs-de-sac or mews environments – if vehicles per hour exceeds 100 (about 170 dwellings), shared space is not acceptable (MHCLG/DfT letter, MfS);
- The total highway width will not be less than 6.8m and will need to be a minimum of 8.6m wide if designated parking is required (MfS/MfGS);
- A continuous protected space for pedestrians must be maintained at all times at a minimum width of 2.0m – this can be located within the 6.8m highway width (MfS/MfGS);

- If parking is not controlled and there is evidence that the highway will be used to accommodate parking, an additional designated parking area a minimum of 1.8m wide will be provided – this brings the highway width up to a minimum of 8.6m (MfS/MfGS);
- The highway will need to be widened on bends (MfS); and
- The design speed is 15mph. If this cannot be achieved, shared space is not acceptable (MfGS)

It is considered that shared space is not in the interest of disabled people who find it difficult to navigate level surfaces when the kerb between the road and pavement is removed. Disabled people are a protected group in the Equality Act 2010. As a result, unless the above can be demonstrated, shared surface shall not be permissible in such locations. It must be robustly demonstrated how the requirements set out in NPPF (2018) Paragraph 110 can be addressed.

Where the above criteria does apply full height upstands will need to be gradually tapered into the shared surface areas with a transitional feature which will alter the visual design with the aim of reducing vehicle speeds. Priority will need to remain with pedestrians.

Swept Path Analysis:

Given that the proposed site layout in its current form is not fully supported, it is likely that revised plans will be submitted. Therefore, the submitted SPA drawings are not accepted by virtue of the comments made regarding the overall layout. A new package of SPA drawings should be submitted in conjunction with a revised layout. The following paragraphs, whilst relating to the submitted drawings, should be referred to when conducting SPA on the revised layout.

In the absence of specific information regarding the type of refuse vehicle used in the area as previous reserved matters proposals in the Stroud District area have been tracked with a 3 axle 10.7m long refuse vehicle, as this may have changed, it is recommended that Stroud District Council is consulted on the type of refuse vehicle that is used in the local area in order to provide a robust assessment. The submitted drawing does not provide a comprehensive assessment of refuse vehicle access through the site, with some junctions / bends omitted. A drawing must be provided which demonstrates that a refuse vehicle is able to serve all portions of the development. This should include SPA of the refuse vehicle passing through all junctions within the development and any other areas that are considered to necessitate tracking in order to prove that refuse vehicles can be accommodated. The refuse vehicle should be demonstrated passing a private estate car (1715mm x 4226mm) along all streets and maintain a minimum of 500mm clearance to boundaries (vertical kerb-line structure, tree, formal parking spaces (including visitor parking spaces) etc.) and between vehicles should be maintained.

To avoid large bend radii's it is acceptable that a car and a refuse do not have to pass each other on a bend, providing that adequate forward visibility is provided to allow drivers to be able see another vehicle prior to committing to the manoeuvre. However, a supermarket delivery box van should be able to pass an estate car on bends and junctions and will also need to be demonstrated on plan.

MfS guidance states that a refuse vehicle must be able to access within 55m of all dwellings, taking into account a maximum carry distance for residents of 30m and for refuse operatives of 25m. It would be useful to submit a refuse strategy alongside the SPA drawings to demonstrate that criteria for collection

distances have been satisfied, noting both single and communal collection points throughout the development.

In addition to refuse vehicle tracking, the SPA plan of a fire tender should be annotated to demonstrate that emergency access can be achieved. In accordance with MfS guidance, fire tenders must be able to access within 45m of all dwellings.

Parking:

Stroud District Council's adopted Local Plan contains parking provision at 1.5 spaces per dwelling (average) 2/dwelling will be required where it can be demonstrated, through a supporting parking study, that a greater parking provision would assist in alleviating an existing, on-street parking problem.

A review of the proposed site layout 'schedule of parking' confirms that this minimum allocation (415 spaces proposed across the site) has been provided through a mixture of on-plot (driveways / car ports) and garage parking. For garages to be included in the overall parking allocation, they must be provided with minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m. A number of dwellings are shown to have space for double parking. The practice of double parking should be avoided where possible, particularly for dwellings located along streets with a high movement function. For example, in the proposed layout double parking is shown on the main access road into the development (serving Plots 199 and 202 for example). This is not preferred because it can lead to complex "car swap" manoeuvres involving vehicles potentially reversing onto the highway and possibly causing delay or safety issues.

In terms of visitor parking, the requirements are to provide one parking space per five dwellings. Any visitor parking provided should be 'well designed and legible', although MfS states that this can be in the form of on-street provision. The current proposals for the layout of visitor parking are currently unknown and should be clarified.

A minimum of one cycle space per dwelling is to be provided. There is no indication in the submitted documents that this requirement has been addressed. It should be demonstrated that a minimum allocation of one cycle space per dwelling can be accommodated, either in garages where provided or an alternative secure storage area where garages are not provided.

Pedestrian / Cycle Access:

The submitted DAS proposed to create an identifiable and legible environment. As discussed in this review, the proposed site layout must be revised to reflect this overarching principle across the site with priority being given first to pedestrians and cyclist.

Pedestrians should be accommodated for throughout the development. A minimum footway width of 2.0m (on both sides of the road) must be provided on all roads. In terms of pedestrian crossing provision, dropped tactile crossings should be provided at all junctions and follow desire lines throughout the development to DDA standard. In addition corduroy paving should be provided where cyclists are directed on to the highway from the cycle path.

Road Safety Audit:

A Stage 1 RSA has been undertaken and submitted with the designer response. Most of the auditor's recommendations have been accepted with alternative measures provided; however there are some recommendations that haven't been. A written response from the auditor is required demonstrating that the proposed alternative measures have been accepted

Statement of Due Regard

Consideration has been given as to whether any inequality and community impact will be created by the transport and highway impacts of the proposed development. It is considered that no inequality is caused to those people who had previously utilised those sections of the existing transport network that are likely to be impacted on by the proposed development.

It is considered that the following protected groups will not be affected by the transport impacts of the proposed development: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, other groups (such as long term unemployed), social-economically deprived groups, community cohesion, and human rights.

Yours sincerely,

Lucas Arinze

Development Co-ordinator