

18/0293 – Highway Officer Comments

1. Visibility splays at junctions and shared accesses need to be shown and conform to manual for streets.
2. Visibility for individual plots needs to conform to manual for streets, where parking spaces do not egress over footways 2m in width or greater, suitable visibility splays would have to be demonstrated. (please note further comments are made regarding footways in a number of points below.)
3. Vehicle tracking needs to be undertaken to demonstrate that a large car and a refuse vehicle can pass safely at all points on the highway. And that refuse vehicles can suitably manoeuvre in turning heads.
4. For the purpose of safe and inclusive mobility tactile crossing points should be provided at all junctions, on or as close to desire lines as is safe and practical.
5. For purpose of promoting walking and providing a porous pedestrian layout a full pedestrian links should be provided at the North Eastern and North Western end of the side linking to the adopted footway. Currently only gated accesses are proposed.
6. Private areas are not permitted to discharge surface water to the highway, suitable drainage should be provided.

Layout

7. The right hand turn between plots 81 and 38 has been formed as a raised table junction but it does not link to a carriageway on the Northern arm, this serves no purpose and is confusing for motorists which is detrimental to highway safety, it should be formed as a conventional bend. Furthermore there is a risk the vehicles will park here and need to reverse back across the bend which would be detrimental to highway safety.
8. The road outside plots 203-206 has no turning head which will lead to vehicles reversing back across the junction, this is detrimental to highway safety, vehicle should be able to turn and egress the junction in a forward gear.
9. The access road to plots 70-90 is not to an adoptable standard, roads that serve more than 5 properties are required to be to an adoptable standard.
Junctions with suitable radii should be formed.
Only a single sub-standard 1.5m footway is provided on one side, footways should be 2.0m in width and be provided on both sides.
Where vehicle parking for plots 76-90 egress directly on to the road from banks of parking vehicle and pedestrian visibility is sub-standard and detrimental to highway safety.
The road does not provide safe or suitable provision for pedestrians, in particular young children and pedestrians with sensory or cognitive impairment.
10. The access road to plots 56-69 is not to an adoptable standard, roads that serve more than 5 properties are required to be to an adoptable standard.
Junctions with suitable radii should be formed.

Footway widths should be 2.0m and obstruction free.

The road does not provide safe or suitable provision for pedestrians, in particular young children and pedestrians with sensory or cognitive impairment.

11. The footway between plots 38-48 reduces to 1.5m behind the visitor parking bays, for the purpose of safe and inclusive pedestrian movements footways should be a minimum of 2.0m in width.
12. The footway between plots 185-205 reduces to 1.5m behind the visitor parking bays and planting areas, for the purpose of safe and inclusive pedestrian movements footways should be a minimum of 2.0m in width.
13. Footway adjacent to plots 108-91 reduces from 1.5m to 1.0m. This does not conform to inclusive mobility standards and is detrimental to pedestrian safety, particular for young children and pedestrians with sensory or cognitive impairment.
For the purpose of safe and inclusive pedestrian movements footways should be a minimum of 2.0m in width and extend around the turning head.
14. Footway adjacent to plots 103-97 is only 1.0m in width. This does not conform to inclusive mobility standards and is detrimental to pedestrian safety, particular for young children and pedestrians with sensory or cognitive impairment. For the purpose of safe and inclusive pedestrian movements footways should be a minimum of 2.0m in width. The footways are required to be 2.0m in width to be adoptable as public highway
15. Footway from plots 138-168 on both sides of the carriageway are only 1.0m in width. This does not conform to inclusive mobility standards and is detrimental to pedestrian safety, particular for young children and pedestrians with sensory or cognitive impairment. For the purpose of safe and inclusive pedestrian movements footways should be a minimum of 2.0m in width. The footways are required to be 2.0m in width to be adoptable as public highway.
16. Footway adjacent to plots 110-124 is only 1.5m in width. For the purpose of safe and inclusive pedestrian movements footways should be a minimum of 2.0m in width.
Where parking spaces abut the highway vehicles will need to move out in to the carriageway before visibility is achieved. The extent of edging out required before visibility is achieved as a result of the reduced footway width is considered to be detrimental to highway safety and increase the risk of side impact collisions.
17. There is no margin strip proposed at the edge of carriageway opposite plots 116-131. A margin should be provided at the edge of the carriageway to prevent the effective reduction of the carriageway width and protect against vehicles impacting vertical items adjacent to the carriageway.

18. There appears to be an embankment and a large body of water directly adjacent to the carriageway opposite plots 116-131 and 138-164. A suitable vehicle restraint will be required to protect against vehicles leaving the carriageway at this location.
19. The bend in proximity to plot 138 has been formed as a raised table junction but there is no carriageway on the Western arm, this is unnecessary and confusing for motorists which is detrimental to highway safety, it should be formed as conventional bend. Furthermore there is the risk that vehicles will park here and need to reverse back toward the bend which would be detrimental to highway safety.

Parking

20. For the purpose of pedestrian visibility Visitor Parking spaces V3-v5 should be broken up or set back from the footway.
21. Parking Spaces for plots 76, 90 are in close proximity to the junction and access/egress movements from the spaces will conflict with vehicle movement at the junction. This will be detrimental to highway safety.
22. Parking for Plots (40)-(54) is divorced from the properties with no direct access from the properties to the parking spaces. This is likely to result in parking on the highway reducing capacity for visitor parking and inhibiting the free flow of traffic.
23. Parking spaces for plots 76-81 and 85-90 are formed in banks, for the purpose of pedestrian visibility they should be broken up or set back from the footway.
24. Accesses for parking areas for plots 01-16, 17-38, 40-54, 169-177 are proposed with entrance/exit points of only 3m in width, this does not allow for 2 vehicles to pass and is therefore considered to be detrimental to highway safety. In order to allow for 2 vehicles to pass and reduce the risk of vehicles reversing on to the highway accesses for parking courtyards should be a minimum width of 4.5m for a minimum length 10m and 4.1m in width thereafter. In addition, given the number of vehicles movements the accesses should be formed as a formal junction arrangement rather than a footway crossover.
25. Access for parking areas for plots 143-148, 149-154 are proposed with entrance/exit points of only 3.5m in width, this does not allow for 2 vehicles to pass and is therefore considered to be detrimental to highway safety. In order to allow for 2 vehicles to pass and reduce the risk of vehicles reversing on to the highway accesses for parking courtyards should be a minimum width of 4.5m for a minimum length 10m and 4.1m in width thereafter. In addition, given the number of vehicles movements the accesses should be formed as a formal junction arrangement rather than a footway crossover.
26. I would question whether vehicles can access/egress spaces 19, 37, 39, 40, 45 50 in a reasonable number of manoeuvres, this should be demonstrated by vehicle tracking to ensure the spaces are usable.

27. Parking for Plots 83 is divorced from the property with no direct access from the property to the parking spaces and likely to result in parking on the highway reducing capacity for visitor parking and inhibiting the free flow of traffic.
28. There are a number of parking courtyards with undercroft access, Plots 127-131, Plots 141-138, 185-186, 198-199, 204-205, these are proposed with entrance/exit points of only 3m in width, this does not allow for 2 vehicles to pass and is therefore considered to be detrimental to highway safety. In order to allow for 2 vehicles to pass and reduce the risk of vehicles reversing on to the highway undercroft parking accesses should be minimum of 4.5m for a minimum length 10m. In addition parking courtyards should be lit in order that they are safe and accessible in darkness hours to encourage their use and avoid displacement of parking to the highway.
29. Plot allocation on the row of dwellings 70-75 is unclear, there appears to be 4 dwellings (two at each end of the row) that are not allocated plot numbers and subsequently have no allocated parking. Can the applicant clarify this and demonstrate that these dwelling have allocated off street parking.
30. Plot allocations for dwellings 127-131 is unclear therefore I am unable to assess parking allocation for individual plots. Can the applicant clearly identify each plot, house type and parking allocations.
31. Plot allocations for dwellings 149-157 is unclear therefore I am unable to assess parking allocation for individual plots. Can the applicant clearly identify each plot, house type and parking allocations.
32. Plot allocations for dwellings 169-177 is unclear therefore I am unable to assess parking allocation for individual plots. Can the applicant clearly identify each plot, house type and parking allocations.
33. There appears to be two dwellings numbered plot 187, one of which has no allocated parking. Can the applicant clarify this and demonstrate the parking allocation for each dwelling.
34. Parking for Plots 194 is divorced from the property with no direct access from the property to the parking spaces, this is likely to lead to parking on the highway reducing capacity for visitor parking and inhibiting the free flow of traffic.
35. Parking for Plots 195 is divorced from the property with no direct access from the property to the parking spaces, this is likely to lead to parking on the highway reducing capacity for visitor parking and inhibiting the free flow of traffic.

36. There appears to be two dwellings numbered plot 200, one of which has no allocated parking. Can the applicant clarify this and demonstrate the parking allocation for each dwelling.
37. Parking for Plots 204-205 is divorced from the property with no direct access from the property to the parking, this is likely to lead to parking on the highway reducing capacity for visitor parking and inhibiting the free flow of traffic.
38. Notwithstanding the above concerns regarding plot numbering and parking allocation there is a significant reduction in parking against the SPG Parking Standards, with a number of 2 and 3 bed properties having a single space reduction. This has been supported by a sustainability test submitted in the appendices of the Transport Statement. I would question the asserted walking distances stated in the assessment, however with consideration of the fact that a prior consent for a higher number of units with a lower overall provision of parking exists I would not raise an objection to the sustainability reduction on this occasion.

Conditions

39. It should be conditioned for full engineering details for the roads including details of widths, gradients, long sections, construction details and specifications, drainage and street lighting must be submitted for approval. The roads must be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings.

S106 Obligations

40. It is considered that the impact on the existing Highways Network of proposed application 18/0293 is commensurate with that of approved application 13/1279. Therefore I would seek to retain the Highways obligations imposed in the s106 agreement that was put in place as a result of application 13/1279.