

MEMORANDUM



From: Service Manager Environment

To: Head of Community Well Being
and Development

Our Ref: P/2016 /0738

Your Ref: P/2016/0738

Date: 19 October 2017

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Section 78 Appeal at Land east of Bottom Road, Summerhill

I am satisfied with the original responses made to this application and wish to inform you that I have no further comments to add.

Copies of the responses are attached for your information.

[Redacted signature block]

SM Service Manager Environment

MEMORANDUM



From:	Service Manager Environment	To:	Head of Community Well-being and Development
Our Ref:	P/2016/0738	Your Ref:	P/2016/0738
Date:	6 September 2016		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 3101 5425 Land East of Bottom Road, Summerhill

Development: Outline application for residential development

I refer to your consultation dated 8 August 2016 in respect of the above.

The site is located on a narrow unclassified highway subject to a 30 mph speed limit; a speed survey undertaken by the applicant revealed lower 85th percentile speeds. The proposed access design indicates that it is possible to achieve visibility splays in accordance with Welsh Government guidelines.

The access itself is located on a road of approximately 3.2m width, inadequate to permit the simultaneous passage of vehicles. The submitted plans demonstrate an intention to widen part of the road to 5.5m and to tie the footway into the existing. The proposed access does not meet current highway design standards.

It does not appear possible to tie into the existing footway as it is only 3.2m wide and land required to widen it is outside the control of the applicant. It is not considered acceptable to create an access into a new housing development of 59 dwellings off a road that is only 3.2m wide.

The roads giving access to the site are considered seriously substandard to serve as access to a further 59 dwellings.

To the north east / west of the site, the road is of substandard width to allow the simultaneous passage of vehicles. The road suffers from inadequate forward visibility due to the road width, high hedgerows and horizontal layout. There is no footway provision for pedestrians. It is of steep gradient in places. There are no facilities for cyclists.

To the south of the site, much of Bottom Road is of substandard width. There is very limited pedestrian provision resulting in pedestrians walking on the highway; the intermittent footways are generally of substandard width. Large numbers of cars parked on the street restrict through flow of traffic.

It is considered that traffic generated by this proposal will detrimentally impact on highway safety and the through flow of traffic on the roads leading to the site.

The transport assessment includes a traffic count done during a school holiday; it is not good practice to undertake traffic counts during school holidays. However the counts show 37 vehicles using the unclassified road to the north of the site in the morning peak hour and 44 during the evening. The traffic generation figures submitted by the applicant conclude that there will be an additional 29 vehicles using the route in the morning peak and a further 20 in the evening.

Assuming these figures are correct this equates to a 78% increase in vehicular usage in the morning peak and a 45% increase in the evening.

Given that the road is of such substandard design and layout, the surrounding road network is considered to be at capacity; any further increase in traffic generation is likely to cause detriment to highway safety. An increase of 45 to 78% in vehicular numbers raises serious concerns.

The application has proposed some minor highway works to aid passing along the restricted length of road to the north east/ west. These minor works are not considered to overcome the concerns over highway safety.

The proposed pedestrian / cycle link to the north of the site gives no indication of how it is possible to enter the highway safely on a bend with substandard visibility. Providing a safe access may result in significant loss of hedgerow.

The internal layout of the site is below current design standards; however as this is an outline application the site layout would be dealt with at reserved matters.

I recommend that the application is refused for the following reasons:

- The roads giving access to the site are by reason of their inadequate width, their horizontal alignment and their substandard pedestrian / cycle provision, unsuitable to accommodate the increase in traffic likely to be generated by the development



14 Service Manager Environment

MEMORANDUM



From:	Service Manager Environment	To:	Head of Community Well-being and Development
Our Ref:	P/2016/0738	Your Ref:	P/2016/0738
Date:	14 December 2016		

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
TOWN AND COUNTRY (GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 1995

Location: O. S Grid Ref: 3101 5425 Land East of Bottom Road, Summerhill
Development: Outline application for residential development

I refer to your revised consultation dated 6 December 2016 in respect of the above.

The site is located on a narrow unclassified highway subject to a 30 mph speed limit. It is unclear from the submitted plan whether adequate visibility can be achieved in a southerly direction due to the presence of a wall belonging to the dwelling known as Greenacres, which appears to obstruct lateral visibility.

The applicant has submitted a revised technical note to address concerns raised over the adequacy of the highway.

The access itself is located on a road of approximately 3.2m width, inadequate to permit the simultaneous passage of vehicles. The submitted plans now demonstrate an intention to create a priority working system.

It is unclear from the plans what forward visibility will be achievable at the proposed priority system as there is a wall belonging to the dwelling known as Greenacres, which appears to obstruct forward visibility.

In order to construct the priority working system it is necessary to lose approximately 15m of footway alongside Bottom Road. In an area where pedestrian provision is already at a premium then the loss of 15m of footway is of some concern.

Increasing the width of the road to 5.5m across the site frontage is likely to increase speeds; this will be of concern where the 5.5m wide road suddenly reduces to 2.95m wide. There are no proposals to demonstrate how this sudden change in the road character will be managed.

The roads giving access to the site are considered seriously substandard to serve as access to a further 59 dwellings.

To the north east / west of the site, the road is of substandard width to allow the simultaneous passage of vehicles. The road suffers from inadequate forward visibility due to the road width, high hedgerows and horizontal layout. There is no footway provision for pedestrians. It is of steep gradient in places. There are no facilities for cyclists.

To the south of the site, much of Bottom Road is of substandard width. There is very limited pedestrian provision resulting in pedestrians walking on the highway; the intermittent footways are generally of substandard width. Large numbers of cars parked on the street restricts through flow of traffic.

It is considered that traffic generated by this proposal will detrimentally impact on highway safety and the through flow of traffic on the roads leading to the site.

The transport assessment includes a traffic count done during a school holiday; it is not good practice to undertake traffic counts during school holidays. However the counts show 37 vehicles using the unclassified road to the north of the site in the morning peak hour and 44 during the evening. The traffic generation figures submitted by the applicant conclude that there will be an additional 29 vehicles using the route in the morning peak and a further 20 in the evening.

Assuming these figures are correct this equates to a 78% increase in vehicular usage in the morning peak and a 45% increase in the evening.

Given that the road is of such substandard design and layout, the surrounding road network is considered to be at capacity; any further increase in traffic generation is likely to cause detriment to highway safety. An increase of 45 and 78% in vehicular numbers raises serious concerns.

The revised highways proposal includes some minor highway works to aid passing along the restricted length of road to the north east/ west.

These works mainly include formalising the existing passing places which will not be of any significant benefit to the capacity on the road as the bays already exist.

Plan 1606404 indicates the removal of brambles and weeds from an area of land that does not appear to be in the applicant's ownership.

Whilst the proposed widened junction will improve manoeuvrability for vehicles, the change in priority means that visibility to the west for vehicles exiting Bottom Road will be seriously substandard.

The proposed cycle link on plan 1606405 is over engineered. Given the width of the highway at this point it is highly likely that the link will be used as another passing bay and vehicles will ride over the foot/cycleway surface. Whilst consideration has to be given to improving cycle links I'm not convinced that this route is particularly suitable for encouraging the use of cycles.

The proposed traffic signals are positioned some 200m apart and their operation will cause some delay to vehicles particularly during peak hours.

The proposed road alterations to accommodate two way passing only allows for the stacking of two vehicles. It would only take a queue of three vehicles to effectively block the road.

The introduction of traffic signals will effectively make the road one way during green light phase which may potentially increase traffic speeds, thereby creating additional danger to pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders using the road

The Council does not support the use of traffic signals on narrow rural roads, in an attempt to control traffic flows.

The proposed improvement works are not considered to overcome the concerns over highway safety.

The internal layout of the site is below current design standards; however as this is an outline application the site layout would be dealt with at reserved matters.

I recommend that the application is refused for the following reasons:

- The roads giving access to the site are by reason of their inadequate width, their horizontal alignment and their substandard pedestrian / cycle provision, unsuitable to accommodate the increase in traffic likely to be generated by the development



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Mn'.

Service Manager Environment