

HIGHWAY AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION

P/OUT/2023/02644

Land west of Church Hill and Land off Butts Close and Schoolhouse Lane, Marnhull

I refer to the above planning application received on 6 November 2023.

There are a number of matters that need further consideration and amendment before the Highway Authority is in a position to provide a positive recommendation for this development proposal, as detailed below. I have split the response into three pertinent sections for clarity's sake.

Full Application - Tess Square

The Planning Statement mentions that the new 30 space car parking area provided for school drop-off and collection and for church use from Church Hill is to be accessed from the primary school via a gated access. Allowing for its position in close proximity to the private access to the south and the Phillips Road junction, I would suggest that it would be preferable that the parking area be provided to the south of the 99 space Tess Square car park and that the new access be deleted from the application. If this is not acceptable to the applicant, then I require full details of the new access to be submitted confirming the width, construction, lighting, etc, to ensure that it will be fit for purpose. As a starting point for the new access serving the community parking area, I would expect the visibility splays to accord with the guidance provided by Manual for Streets (MfS). It would appear that due to land ownership constraints offsets are required in both directions along the road to provide the necessary distance of 43m. I also note that a reduced x distance is applied to the northern sight line. Before I am prepared to accept these reduced dimensions I need to see the sight lines accurately shown on a survey base, which takes into account the geometry of the highway in the immediate vicinity of the site.

Can the site plan be amended to clearly show the proposed public visitor cycle parking hoops to be provided. I appreciate that they are on the submitted site plan but they are very difficult to see.

Paragraph 4.15 confirms that the proposed commercial development does not comply with the Authority's car parking guidance, identifying a shortfall of 48 spaces. I do appreciate that demand for spaces will vary and that a proportion of trips will be linked. I'm not sure that the suggestion of using the proposed school car park as an overflow is a sensible suggestion, allowing for its location some distance from the commercial units and the likelihood of conflict at school opening and closing. The applicant should submit further evidence backing up their view regarding link trips so that a proper justification for a reduction in parking numbers can be considered.

Again, as the applicant suggests that linked-trips provide a rationale for not complying with the guidance then supporting data should be submitted to evidence that approach.

It is noted that there does not appear to be a direct pedestrian link provided from the community car park (if it is to be provided) to the church.

Survey data should be submitted confirming the width of available carriageway and associated verges from the Phillips Road junction north to the site access. This will allow an accurate assessment to be made of the suitability of the road to cater for the additional traffic associated with the commercial development (allowing for the fact that the development site will be accessed by large service vehicles).

Outline Application - Butts Close

The application is seeking approval for the means of access into the site. It must be noted that there are elements of the illustrative estate road layout that do not meet with the Authority's requirements and will need resolution at the reserved matters stage should this application be approved.

The new access from Butts Close should reflect the design that was previously agreed for P/OUT/2021/03030. This provides access to the development site from Butts Close, which will be extended through a change in priority to provide an entrance into the site. The existing cul-de-sac to the west will form a side junction with the proposed extension resulting in a new cul-de-sac serving the terraced housing. The agreed arrangement is shown on Dwg No D20117-MA-XX-XX-SK-C-0004 P06, referred to in Condition 14 of the decision notice for that application.

The proposed vehicular access onto the B3092 (Schoolhouse Lane) suggests that 2m footways will be provided on either side of the carriageway. However, there are no pedestrian footways in the vicinity of this junction. I am concerned that residents will use the desire line from this new access to walk north along the main road to the church and the nearby pub. I suggest, therefore, that this new vehicular access be deleted from the proposal and that the site is solely accessed from Butts Close. This will, of course, necessitate the amendment of the traffic flow predictions provided within the TA.

If the applicant does not wish to pursue this option, then they should provide a safe pedestrian facility from the Schoolhouse Lane access north into the settlement.

For the new access, should it be retained within the scheme, I note that the highway consultants have used the guidance provided by DMRB to establish the stopping distances needed. I am content that MfS2 is worked to at this location and the y distance can be reduced to 79m, if desired

TRANSPORT STATEMENT

Paragraph 3.8 states that the eastern footway along Church Hill ends 30m north of the existing site access. It actually ends 30m north of the Phillips Road junction. This error should be corrected.

It also then calls into question the pedestrian connectivity of the commercial site to the village as a whole. The internal footpaths to be provided either link onto existing unsurfaced public rights-of-way or there is a singular pedestrian access via the access onto Church Hill, where there is no available footway to cross onto. I would suggest that pedestrian links need to be given further consideration. Perhaps a partial solution could be to provide a new 2m wide footway on the western side of Church Hill? This could include a narrowing of the carriageway with some form of priority give-way arrangement which would also act as a traffic calming feature?

The figures shown in paragraph 4.3 for the proposed mixed-use development are different to those shown on Table 4 of paragraph 4.4. This will alter the figures quoted in paragraph 5.12.

I note that trip rates have been obtained from the TRICS (v.7.9.4) database but would comment that the latest version of TRICS is 7.10.3.

For the results of the TRICS assessment demonstrated in Table 10, for the shopping centre the total should be 264.155, not 227.921, which equates to 789 two-way movements per 12 hour period.

In paragraph 6.9 it is mentioned that P/RES/2022/05524) has yet to be determined. This application was approved on 16 May 2023 so it does need to be included within the trip generation assessment.

Paragraph 6.11 confirms that Church Hill / Burton Street / Pilwell Street and Walton Elm Hill / B3092 / Eastwell Lane have been included within the trip distribution assessment study area but neither appear to have been included within the diagram of the results in Appendix H.

The proposal will provide a new 30 space car park for school use. It would appear that this element of the proposal has not been included within the trip assessment.

DEFER

Steve K Savage
Transport Development Manager
Highways
Dorset Council

[01305 224157](tel:01305224157)
dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

