PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

To: James Lloyd Huntingdonshire District Council Pathfinder House St.Mary's Street Huntingdon PE29 3TN	**Place and Economy** **Highway Development Management** Infrastructure and Growth East Highways Division Stirling Way Witchford CB6 3NR
Application Reference: 17/01375/OUT	
Date: 19th November 2018	**Contact**: Mr N J Eggar

Proposal: **Outline planning permission for residential development of up to 40 dwellings (Use Class C3) including means of access into site (not internal roads), parking and associated works, with all other matters (relating to appearance, landscaping, scale and layout) reserved.**

Location: **Land North East Of Mandene Gardens, Great Gransden.**

Transport Case Review for Planning Committee 19th November 2018.

Primarily, please convey my apologies to Members for not attending the Committee meeting.

I have reviewed the application, the supporting material and comments; I confirm that I have inspected the local street network and that I am familiar with the local area. I would make the following observations:

The application falls in to a category where a formal transport assessment is not required; notwithstanding the above, the application is supported by a comprehensive Transport Statement.

1. The Transport Statement is supported by empirical data collected by an independent professional traffic survey company, collected on representative days. The data comprises:

- 7 day Automatic Traffic Counters (ATC's) to establish background traffic volume, nature and speeds on the network (counters located on Sand Road, Mill Road and East Street;

- Manual Classified Turning Count (MCC) at the junction of Mandene Gardens to determine local residential vehicle trips rates.

2. The ATC data demonstrate that the local streets are relatively lightly trafficked, with flows typically not exceeding 500 - 600 two-way vehicle movements in a 24 period, with the busiest peak hour on East Street/ Mill Road recording up to 70 two-way hourly movements (typically around 40 – 50 movements in the busiest PM peak), and Sand Road not exceeding 110 two-way movements on a single recorded day (typically around 80 movements in busiest the AM peak). Heavy commercial vehicle movements are similarly low on East Street/ Mill Road, comprising around 1% of the overall traffic flow.

3. I have reviewed the County Council Traffic Accident Reporting database; in the last 3 years there has been a single vehicle accident (8th September 2015) on Middle Street south of the East Street/ Mill Road junction. The accident did not involve any other vehicles or vulnerable road users.

4. On the basis of the trip rates derived from the MCC count and factored to the proposed development not exceeding 40 dwellings, the proposed development may generate around 26 additional two-way vehicle movements in the busiest peak hours.

5. Apportioning these movements to the local road network based upon the turning movements derived from the MCC, the busiest directional traffic flow relating to the site will be in the AM peak to the East Street/ Mill Road junction, with a nominal 15 movements in the busiest hour (9 departures and 6 arrivals).

6. The applicant's consultant has used Transport Research Laboratory industry standard junction capacity assessment tool Junctions 9, to review capacity at the proposed site access junction with Sand Road. The results indicate the site access will operate with around 97% residual capacity. The assessment has not been conducted on the off-site junctions, which is reasonable given the scale and impact of the development and the limited background traffic flows.

7. The proposed development is accessed via a simple priority 'T' junction, which incorporates appropriate geometry and junction visibility in relation to the scale of the development and the speed of traffic on Sand Road.

8. The applicant has proposed improvements at the junction of Sand Road, East Street/ Mill Road and Church Street. The improvements comprise footway links to facilitate pedestrian crossing points from Sand Road to Church Street, and Sand Road to East Street. Further, the development will secure a visibility splay over the frontage of the existing dwelling on the south east side of the junction of Mill Road/ Sand Street (commensurate with the recorded speed of traffic), across which there are no current highway rights.

Conclusion

The proposal comprises a modest form of development with a limited highway impact.

The small number of additional trips generated by the proposals is unlikely to result in any greater discernible risk for existing or future highway users, particularly where a reasonable level of mitigation is proposed.

The local street network is relatively lightly trafficked and has a nominal accident record; the additional traffic likely to be generated by the development, dispersed across the network, will not have a severe impact upon capacity, or a significant impact upon safety in the context of the NPPF.

Accordingly, I do not consider that a highway objection on grounds of capacity or safety could be substantiated in the event of any subsequent appeal.

Nigel Eggar MCIHT MIHE MTPS

Associate Director WSP
Managing Consultant – on behalf of Highways Development Management