

Hi Matthew,

I refer to the above mentioned application and I apologise for the delay in responding fully to this consultation. I make the following Highway comments on the submission;

I note the proposal seeks to convert Courtfield House in to five residential units, consisting of two 1 bedroom, one 2 bedroom and two 3 bedroom units. In addition, the proposal also includes 16 two/three bedroom new build dwellings located within the grounds of Courtfield House, with access primarily sought from the existing Court Mills access road.

There have been a number of local representations on this application and many have cited concerns with regards to the additional traffic generated by the development using Polebarn Road in particular. Polebarn Road has restricted parking, with time limited bays allocated on one side of the road permitting short-term parking. This effectively narrows part of the road to single width, however, the benefit of this is that vehicle speed is controlled along this straight section of road as a result. Courtfield House would have generated a significant amount of traffic when it was fully occupied as a preparatory school and the submitted Transport Statement suggests that this created around 70 two-way vehicle movements per day, based on the Agent's TRICS analysis. The details of this TRICS analysis have not been included within the submission and I would thus expect to see the output reports included in the Transport Statement, along with a comparison analysis of the AM and PM peak period movements between the previous and proposed use on the site.

Two vehicular access points are proposed to the site, with parking for plots 17, 18 and 21 located in the existing car park to the East of the site and the other 18 dwellings gaining access to their parking allocation through a new access through the 'Wool Store', from the private Court Mills access road. As per my email dated 19th June 2018, the private access road serving Court Mills is not shown within the redline site boundary and my understanding is that this must be shown within the red line up to the existing public highway, with the necessary notice served on the land owner.

The submission does state that the applicant has two-way access rights over the Court Mills access road and that the 4m width of this road is adequate to accommodate the development. What this fails to highlight is that a recent planning approval under reference 18/03020/FUL seeks to convert the Court Mills building in to seven residential dwellings and as part of this application, the private access road will become one-way with entry being from the Northernmost access and egress from the Southernmost access nearest to Roundstone Surgery. Furthermore, this proposal includes the provision of residential parking spaces along the access road, which reduces the width of running carriageway to just 3m. Assuming the proposals at Court Mills are built out and as I understand it works have already commenced on site, it is essential that the proposals subject to this application acknowledge and design for these proposed access arrangements, which currently, they do not (For clarity, if the Court Mills proposals are not built out, the existing road width would not be sufficient to accommodate two-way traffic from the development, as a minimum of 4.8m would be required).

Whilst a scheme to ensure one-way vehicle movements can be readily implemented for the development through signage, of paramount concern is the impact that this significant increase in vehicular traffic along this access road will have on pedestrian and cycle movements in the vicinity. The existing footway adjacent to the access road is in fact a Public Footpath (TROW35) and there is also an existing signed cycle route along the access road itself, both of which provide access to Town Park and experience significant pedestrian and cycle movements as a result. Pedestrians and cyclists will continue to use this route in both directions with cyclists on road and a 3m width access road was accepted for the Court Mills development despite the cycle route, based on the relatively low amount of vehicular movement generated taking in to consideration the previous use of the Court

Mills building. This proposal however seeks to provide access to 18 additional dwellings along this route and the 3m width of the access road is insufficient to accommodate this along with two-way cycle flows without creating detriment to highway safety. I would therefore expect to see at least 3.8m width along this access road to accommodate the development traffic and cyclists. This will require moving the parking spaces proposed for the Court Mills development further in to the grassed area, as well as providing a marked cycle contraflow lane on the access road to a width of 800mm, but I note that this is land that is outside of the control of the applicant.

Concern is also raised with regards to the access in to the site from the Court Mills access road, as this appears to be partly obstructed by parking proposed for the Court Mills development. This space will therefore need to be relocated and swept path analysis submitted to demonstrate that the turning manoeuvres required are achievable in the context of a one-way operating system, which appears an odd manoeuvre due to the alignment of the access. Concern is also raised with regards to conflict with pedestrians at the access point and I note that vehicle-pedestrian inter-visibility splays have been shown on the submitted drawings. Whilst these splays are adequate, additional protection will be required in the form of two bollards either side of the access to direct pedestrians in to the centre of the footway. Furthermore, the lowered section of wall that is proposed at a height of 900mm should be lowered further to 600mm to ensure children are visible, which is essential considering the close proximity of Town Park.

Within the site the submission states that the internal access road will be shared space in design, however, the design is more akin to a parking area/ car park, with little delineation other than that for the parking spaces. The submission states that the opening in the rear wall of the Wool Store is 6m, however, this opening is pinched to around 4m due to Plot 13's front garden, which is insufficient to act as shared space. Turning provision within the site is accommodated for refuse vehicles in the Wool Store parking area and the swept path analysis will need updating as mentioned above to ensure the one-way system is complied with. I note that the submission also states that a turning area is provided for cars next to plot 14, however, this does not conform to standard and I would also expect this to be amended or swept path analysis used to demonstrate the manoeuvre is feasible. In general, some form of restrictions will be required to ensure any turning areas remain free at all times and do not attract additional parking.

Parking provision has been provided to meet Wiltshire's Car Parking Standards, however, I do have concerns with the lack of turning provision provided for plots 17, 18 and 21, as this will require reverse manoeuvres on the public highway. Whilst this is an unclassified road, it is also a busy stretch of road with Magnet and Roundstone Surgery nearby and thus a lot of vehicular, pedestrian and cycle activity past this access point making reverse manoeuvres undesirable. Additionally, these spaces are located in what appears to be a well-used car park, but I cannot see any restrictions or information on site or in the submission about who is able to use this parking area. The loss of this parking area could well cause a significant amount of parking displacement and I would expect the existing details of this arrangement to be clarified.

Finally, it is stated that cycle parking will be provided in accordance with Wiltshire's Cycle Parking Standards, however, it is not clear how or where this will be provided for each residential unit.

In general therefore, I do have serious concerns with regards to the access arrangements proposed and in particular, the conflict this may create between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists. I note that previous pre-application discussions with this Highway Authority (for a different type of development) centred on an access through the existing car park to the East of the site and I am not

sure why this hasn't been proposed for this development, as this would alleviate a number of these concerns.

Based on that submitted, I must recommend that this application is refused on Highway grounds for the following reasons;

1. The road serving the site is not suitable to support the increase in vehicular use resulting from the proposed development, which is essential in the interests highway safety.
2. The proposal will create conflict between vehicles, between vehicles and pedestrians and between vehicles and cyclists at the proposed access and on the substandard access road, to the detriment of highway safety within the area for all users.
3. The proposal does not give adequate consideration to existing parking provision and will have a detrimental effect on the safety of road users at this point and the amenity of neighbouring property owners.

NOTE: I am happy to discuss this further with the applicant/ agent to see if an acceptable scheme can be agreed, but this is likely to require the agreement of the adjacent land owner also.

Kind regards,
Chris

Chris Manns BSc (Hons) MSc
Highways DC Engineer (Level 3)
Sustainable Transport Group