



		Highways Development Management Shire Hall Gloucester <u>GL1 2TH</u>	
Lucy White Cheltenham Borough Council P.O. Box 12 Municipal Offices Promenade Cheltenham Glos GL50 1PP		Email: <a href="mailto:stephen.hawley@gloucestershire.gov.uk">stephen.hawley@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a>	
Our Ref: B/2020/045659		Your Ref: 20/01069/OUT	Date: 17 August 2020
<b>Proposal:</b>	Development comprising of up to 250 residential dwellings including provision of associated infrastructure, ancillary facilities, open space and landscaping, demolition of existing buildings and formation of new vehicular access from Harp Hill. Approval sought for means of access to site from Harp Hill with all other matters reserved for future consideration  Oakley Farm Priors Road Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL52 5AQ	<b>Received date:</b>	16 July 2020
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<del>No objection</del>	<del>No objection (Subject to conditions)</del>	
	Refusal	Further information	<b>X</b>
<b>Document(s), drawing(s) and reference(s):</b>		<b>Planning history ref(s):</b>	
<b>Details of recommendation:</b>	<p>The application proposes upto 250 dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access. The site does not form part of the adopted Joint Core Strategy.</p> <p>The access strategy can be separated out into key topics of consideration.</p> <p><u>Immediate Pedestrian / Cycle access</u></p> <p>The application proposes a shared use cycleway/footway on to Priors Road. Insufficient detail as been provided on this connection. Drawing H828/06 (in appendix H) show part of this link, but no dimensions are provided, a</p>		

comprehensive drawing showing the full length and width is required. It also shows a new toucan crossing and cycleway, the applicant should show details of the cycleway width and design standards, and the visibility of the crossing given the adjoining street trees. Additionally, the proposal oversails the existing public footpath, this is important as it is unlawful to cycle on a footpath, therefore the owner of the site would need to convey a higher access right to allow cycling to occur. Without higher rights existing the site would rely on Harp Hill for cycle access only which is not considered to be suitable due to the gradient.

#### Immediate Vehicle Access

The proposal provides a new bellmouth onto Harps Hill, this is supported with visibility splays using the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile approach speeds. The proposal however fails to provide any details of the dimension of the access or any tracking details and as such this access cannot be agreed. The access also needs to account for the entry into the site, observation indicates that there is a considerable gradient from the access into the site. The applicant has provided an indicative long section this shows a 1 in 20 gradient onto Harp Hill, however to access the majority of the development 160m of 1 in 12.5 is shown, this is unacceptable and no greater lengths than 30m are permitted at that gradient, additionally 1 in 20 should be maintained at the junction. The information submitted is lacking in terms of detail of the access and the indicative sections shows significant challenges which even with considerable earth works would be unacceptable.

#### Improvements to Harp Hill and Priors Road to Active Travel

New footway is proposed on Harp Hill and Cycleway improvements made to Prior Road including a new toucan crossing. The applicant proposes to address these through a planning obligation as a contribution towards the proposals. The Highway Authority is not satisfied through this approach, the works are necessary to deliver the proposal and as such they should be secured through a planning condition and delivered by a section 278 agreement prior to the first occupation of any dwelling. Therefore, any permission granted should include a condition requiring the applicant to deliver the works define in appendix H and I of the TA.

#### Off Site Vehicle Mitigation

The TA assesses several junctions in accordance with the agreed scoping paper, the applicant has concluded that there is an impact at the junction of Harp Hill/Priors Road/Hales Road and Hewlett Road which requires mitigation and all other junctions assessed will experience no impact. A drawing of a mitigation scheme for the above junction is provided in appendix R of the TA and the applicant proposes to pay the Highway Authority to deliver this scheme. The Highway Authority does not share these conclusions nor the form of scheme delivery as the development requires it to facilitate access, therefore it should

be secured through a planning condition and delivered through a section 278 agreement.

The Highway Authority has reviewed the mitigation scheme in appendix R. It is accepted that the Junction 9 modelling report indicates that the scheme is beneficial however caution is needed on the over reliance of the model and practical consideration is also needed on the likely implications of the scheme to drivers.

Recognising that the AM peak is most sensitive in this instance the correct comparison of junction performance through modelling along is a comparison of table 7.2 scenario 2 and table 7.5 scenario 3A. This looks at a 2024 scenario without development and with development and mitigation, the modelling demonstrates that mitigated scenario shows an erosion of capacity on the east roundabout on all arms.

When considering the actual mitigation scheme it is considered that the modelling results are likely to be realised and the junction is more likely to form as recorded in the current geometry as shown in table 7.5 scenario 3. The proposal widens the “flare” length and “entry width” as defined in CD116 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, however due to the reverse curve these benefits do not result in any change to the give way point and the widening is modest so is unlikely to change a drivers approach position in any meaningful manner. Therefore the modelling result of the mitigation scheme are correct by virtual of the method adopted, but in practice is unlikely to actually change in driver behaviour, hence the Highway Authority considers the no mitigation reporting to be more realistic and this shows significant capacity erosion as a result of the scheme.

Additionally, a review of the modelling outputs shows unmitigated harm at the following junctions:

- Priors Road / Bouncers Lane
- Prestbury Road / Tatchley Lane / Deep Street / Blacksmiths Lane / Bouncers Lane
- A40 London Road / Old Bath Road / Hales Road

The above junctions should be re appraised and suitability mitigated with a scheme that has the agreement of the Highway Authority. Additionally, a further capacity test is required recognising the lack of local plan designation, the future assessment year should be 2031 to match the local plan assessment period, and all assessment should be undertaken using Temprow 7.2b which is the latest release. This may be best reviewed using the GCC Saturn model.

The applicant has submitted a travel plan to reduce the need to travel and encourage sustainable mode of travel. The applicant has indicated that it their intention for make payment to The Highway Authority to deliver this plan on

their behalf, this approach overall is considered to be acceptable. A review of the TP shows that it lacks ambition, the targets are too low and doesn't look to promote personal travel planning as a primary treatment. The travel plan needs to be updated to set an ambitious agenda and series of interventions.

It is therefore necessary for the applicant to review the proposal in light of the above comments and submit a TA addendum and new TP addressing these points.

It is also brought to the applicants attention that Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (July 2020) is available which includes details which may assist the preparation of a TA addendum.

Stephen Hawley BSc (Hons) IEng MCIHT FIHE MTPS Cert(mgmt)open  
 Highway Development Management Team Leader  
 Highways Development Management  
 Communities Infrastructure

<b>Required consultation:</b>	<b>ITU</b>		<b>Highways Records</b>	
	<b>Rd Safety</b>		<b>Fire Service</b>	
	<b>PROW</b>		<b>Structures</b>	
	<b>LHM</b>		<b>Police</b>	