

LAND AT BIRCHINGTON ON SEA – Transport Assessment (TA) Comments - initial comments

Outline planning application, with all matters reserved except for access, for a mixed-use urban extension comprising: up to 1,650 residential units (use class C3); residential care home (use class C2); two form entry primary school (use class F1); land for the expansion of the existing Birchington medical centre; mixed use centre (use class E, F1 and F2); and associated infrastructure including provision of a new strategic link road between Minnis Road and Manston Road, alterations to existing junctions and new access arrangements from Minnis Road, Park Lane, Canterbury Road and Manston Road/Acol Hill, a new recreational and leisure shared-use link between Minnis Road and Park Lane, green infrastructure including public open space and associated facilities, landscaping, formal and informal play areas, utilities (including drainage) and associated ancillary works and structures.

The highway authority has the following comments to make in relation to the submitted application documentation.

Draft Heads of Terms for S106 Agreement

The draft Heads of Terms Document is noted, and it is encouraging to see that reference is made to the provision of a financial contribution towards strategic highway improvements within the district of Thanet. However, at this stage there are no monetary figures attached to this document or proposed trigger points for payment. Therefore, at this stage there is insufficient certainty that the necessary funding will be secured.

Further dialogue will need to take place with the applicant to provide clarity over this issue. It is expected that financial contributions should follow the broad principles outlined within the Technical Note - Strategic Site Allocations Impact (July 2018) which was published alongside the recently adopted Thanet Local Plan, with necessary adjustments made to account for the increased housing delivery on the site when compared to the current allocation and any changes in overall project costs.

Transport Assessment

Section 1 – Introduction

1.1- The Site Location Plan does not appear to delineate the full extents of the Local Plan allocation. There is a triangular parcel to the northwest that is not included, full access to this land would need to be shown on the access and movement parameter plan.

1.8 – It is agreed that the modelling undertaken was done on the understanding that the final development proposals would mirror those housing proposals. Whilst it is agreed that subsequent reduction to 1650 dwellings does mean that modelling outputs will represent a robust assessment, it is necessary to point out that this proposal does not utilise all the land that was included within the adopted allocation. It is unclear whether this additional land will still form part of the strategic allocation (but will come forward later) and as such should be included within 2031 forecast assumptions – clarification is therefore required.

Section 3 – Development Proposals

3.2 – The forecasts made within the TA are purely based upon 1,800 dwellings, 150 more than is being proposed under this application for the sake of providing a robust assessment. However, trip generations for the proposed care home are not included, the omission of which challenges this assumption. Notwithstanding this, at face value it is unlikely that the care home will generate and overall traffic burden more than the 1,800 dwelling scenario that has been tested.

3.4 – The proposed specification of the link roads is acknowledged, although it should be noted that there will be a substantial difference between the likely traffic flows and operational demands made on its two sections. The southern link road will form part of the primary road network whereas the northern link road will be a local distributor road. Consequently, the southern link will need to align with the requirements of the wider Major Road Network (MRN) bid in progress and flexibility built into the scheme to increase the specification as needed. The Masterplan indicates the potential for a significant number of private accesses and road junctions which would inherently cause delay on the southern link. Such an arrangement would also prove cumbersome on the northern link where bus services are proposed.

We are seeking the demarcation of a reserved highway corridor through the southern site showing approximate alignment and sufficient land to accommodate a 7.3 metre carriageway, along with the proposed cycle/footways, SuDS and other services. We would also need to see a Road Hierarchy Plan, which could form part of a Design Code for any forthcoming reserved matters. Finally, we request that any CAD drawings for the proposed junctions and road alignments are shared to assist with the ongoing development of the KCC promoted MRN bid.

3.6 – It should be noted that a footway width of 1.8 metres would be considered the absolute minimum provision along a secondary road within the hierarchy, but our preference would be 2 metres in line with national guidance. Consideration must be given to offering a wider cycle/footway adjacent to the proposed primary school, where students and parents will be likely to congregate at peak times.

The inclusion of a Zebra crossing on the northern link road a little south of the new roundabout junction with Minnis Road appears to be for the purpose of providing continuation along the southern side of Minnis Road. This appears to be too far removed from the pedestrian desire line to be used for that purpose but could be realigned to serve pedestrians moving between the north-western parcel of the site towards the health centre and the town centre beyond. The need for any additional formal crossings has been assessed in Section 5, although this concludes that none are required based on assumed pedestrian movements. Generally, there are no other crossing facilities indicated for the spine road through the site, either on the masterplan or the movement parameter plan. We would need to see indicative locations that adhere closely to existing PROWs and likely pedestrian desire lines. Consideration should be given to appropriate crossing facilities serving the school and this should be subsequently reflected on the Access Parameter Plans.

3.7 – The proposed on-site cycling/walking facilities provide a substantial length of the ‘Quex to Coast’ route but it must be noted that existing network is not comprehensive and improved links to

it should be further explored under this application. Improved cycling facilities on Minnis Road and linkages with the Viking Coastal Trail would maximise the benefits of the internal facilities and enhance the sustainability of the site and these should be explored as part of proposed development infrastructure.

3.9 – The ongoing discussion regarding bus services to the site would also need to include the KCC Public Transport team and any diversions or new services would need to be examined in conjunction with the Westgate development site to fully inform the S106 Heads of Terms.

To the knowledge of the Highway Authority, no specific discussions have taken place between the applicant to date in relation to future public transport provision, therefore it is not currently clear whether the diversion of service 34 is feasible and what additional funding might be required to pump prime such a solution.

Clarification is required to inform ongoing discussions over Section 106 heads of terms with respect to Public Transport contributions (if deemed necessary). In the meantime, indicative bus stop locations suitable for shelters and raised bus boards should be included within the masterplan/access parameter plans.

3.11 – As in 3.4, it is necessary to agree a secured land corridor for the link roads, allowing for some flexibility of alignment. We require further clarification to inform strategic highway scheme proposals through the S106.

Adjacent to the northern link road lies a proposed cricket pitch, mitigation for stray cricket balls will need to be considered as part of the masterplan/detailed design and this may need to be a consideration when finalising the location of this facility.

3.12-3.14 – The sole vehicular access for Phase 1B of development will be via a priority junction onto Park Lane. This access is proposed to serve at least 112 dwellings prior to the completion of the southern link road. The impact of Phase 1B on Park Lane and the local road network, especially at Acol and Birchington Square however, has not been assessed. Further clarification is required.

The proposed access on Park Lane for Phase 1B is currently located within a derestricted section of carriageway. Until such time as the proposed extension to the 40mph limits could be enacted via the TRO process, the visibility splays of 2.4mx120m would not be adequate, unless supported by a speed survey to evidence existing vehicle approach speeds. The access also requires swept path drawings for a 13 metre length refuse freighter.

The proposed traffic calming measures on Park Lane as outlined in drawing 1605-27 PL04 are in our view unlikely to be effective in managing vehicle approach speeds and self-enforcing the proposed change in speed limit. The scope for excessive speed has been raised within the accompanying Road Safety Audit and is considered self-evident through the existing interactive speed sign in this location. Due to the relatively straight alignment of the carriageway in this location, it is likely that further traffic calming measures will be required, in the form of either traffic prioritisation or vertical/horizontal deflections, along with any required street lighting which may have an impact on light spread close to Quex Park.

The plans show a new section of footway linking the site with the entrance of Quex Park, although this is not included in the red line application boundary, so it is unclear whether it is the applicant's intention to provide this link. This footway also falls outside the existing highway boundary. As such a link would form the final leg of the 'Quex to Coast' leisure route this would ideally support both pedestrian and cycle movements and be in the public domain, where it could then continue northward to link with the existing footway on the northern side of the access via drop kerbs over the bell mouth access to Quex Park. Further clarification is required.

Furthermore, it is assumed that any such schemes on Park Lane are intended to be operational prior to the occupation of Phase 1B, so that residents may benefit from speed attenuation measures and pedestrian/cycle access to the north, although this is not confirmed in the TA.

3.15 - Park Lane /Acol Hill Roundabout - KCC is currently in the process of promoting its own bid for infrastructure funding through the Major Road Network fund and this route/junction forms part of this project. Therefore, an audit of the compatibility of these proposed junction works with this emerging project is necessary. To facilitate this piece of work, please can the applicant supply all CAD drawings and junction model files relating to this proposed junction to allow a full compatibility check to be completed. Until this has been completed, it is necessary to reserve the right to provide further technical feedback. Swept paths are also required for a 13 metre length refuse freighter, buses and HGV's showing all manoeuvres at this roundabout.

It is noted that an additional crossing point over Park Lane is proposed adjacent to Acol Hill Farm, although neither the crossing or paths linking it to the development and the indicated footway on the north side of Manston Road are included in the application boundary. It appears to facilitate the continuation of an internal route onto the wider highway network but does not clarify if the applicant intends to provide the new footway on the northern side of Manston Road and the extents of any works, as well as how it ties in with the MRN scheme in this location.

3.16-3.18 – The principle of the proposed signal-controlled junction on the A28 is noted, although the following comments to make on its design and modelling:

- The pedestrian signals will all need to be positioned on the near side. Toucan crossings (facilitating continuation of the Quex to Coast cycle route) will need to be 4m wide, Puffin crossings will need to be 3.2m wide. Currently the proposed layout shows the crossings as being 2m wide.
- The submitted Stage 1 Road safety Audit does not consider the future adjacent access to the community centre or primary school. Any queuing at the junction may impact on access to these facilities. Considering that the modelling is purely for 1,800 dwellings and does not include the school, any vehicles heading back to the southern half of the site after drop-off or picking up will add to queuing on the northern arm of the junction. Consequently, this access arrangement should be included in the scope of the RSA for the proposed junction, as there are very few alternative access locations that could be implemented within the constraints of the current masterplan.
- I note that provision for horse riders is restricted to the use of advance areas on the northern and southern arms of the junction. These are marked on the plan as advance cycle boxes which may lead to confusion for cyclists as to where they should position themselves

to cross this junction. Our preference would be for the provision of Toucan crossings to facilitate cyclists. Problem 4 of the RSA highlights the lack of off-carriageway provision for horse riders that needs to be addressed at this stage. It is suggested that the applicant engages with the British Horse Society to seek their views on potential access arrangements (considering the constraints of the site).

- Taking the above into consideration, the LINSIG model should be re-run with the maximum extendable inter-green clearance times used. To provide a robust assessment, the LINSIG model should be re-run using a 120 second cycle time with the signals single cycled. The LINSIG model currently uses a 240 second cycle time with the signals double cycling. The geometric saturation flows should be used on all arms of the junction, including the exit arms. Finally, we would require the LINSIG input file for checking.
- The applicant would need to supply all CAD drawing and junction model files relating to this proposed junction to allow a full compatibility check to be completed.
- It would be necessary to relocate the limits of the exiting 30mph to south of the new junction, which would be subject to the TRO process.
- The proposed left turn filter A28 to northern link road is outside of the red line boundary, which would need to be clarified.
- Further information in relation to forward visibility to signal heads and queues on the eastbound approach, given the relatively steep nature of the carriageway in this location.

3.19 – Minnis Road roundabout - I note that although swept path drawings have been provided for refuse and buses, the refuse freighter should be 13 metres in length and all manoeuvres should be shown, not just the left-turns. The highway authority would wish for further commentary to be provided regarding the relatively low level of traffic modelled through this junction. It may be necessary for further sensitivity tests to be applied to ensure that it does not lead to blocking back to the Minnis Road Signals.

3.20 – Whilst servicing and delivery access can usually be assessed at the detailed design stage, it is relevant to highlight at this stage that the proposed Masterplan locates the community hub very close to the proposed signal junction with the A28. This could lead to difficulties in identifying a solution to servicing on street, therefore these potential constraints should be considered at this stage to ensure that sufficient space is provided to achieve safe and effective loading and turning provision for this part of the development.

3.21 – It is expected that the parking standards for a Suburban Edge location will be applied to this site when it comes forward to reserved matters.

Section 4 - Policy Context

4.55 - The summary stating that the development is in line with local, regional, and national planning policy will be dictated largely by the level of financial contributions secured towards strategic highway infrastructure. Failure to secure the necessary funding towards such infrastructure would then not accord with site specific policy (SP47) contained within the Adopted Thanet Local Plan.

Section 5 – Trip Attraction and Movement

5.5 - Trip rates for the proposed development are agreed and are consistent with those used within recent Local Plan forecast assessments. The vehicle trips associated with the proposed school and community hub do not appear to have been included but are largely assumed to be internal.

5.12 - The pedestrian trip forecasts are noted, however it is relevant to point out that the trip assessment does not consider the likely pedestrian trip draw from existing residents /communities within reasonable proximity to the proposed development site. Features such as the open space, Quex to Coast route, new school site and community infrastructure will be trip attractors, particularly on foot. Essentially such trips will be additional to those identified using national trip rate datasets as outlined within this document.

In addition to the above, the TRICS data used to forecast non car trips may not adequately represent the proximity of the site to the coastline and the leisure amenities that exist. Therefore, the presence of walking trips could be higher than those used as a comparable within TRICS. We would welcome further dialogue from the application regarding this point, particularly as this has a bearing on the use of existing footway and PROW infrastructure, which the KCC PROW team will comment on separately.

5.20 – The assumption is made that the land south of the southern link road will generate mostly leisure trips, whereas the masterplan indicates that this land is entirely residential. This unspecified number of dwellings will in our view generate pedestrian trips towards the town centre for business purposes and shopping, as well as Quex Park, so is capable of generating a number of trips commensurate with a formal crossing. Given the future nature of the southern link road as a bypass route around Birchington and Westgate and the nature of traffic likely to use this route on a regular basis, a signalised crossing should be considered within the proximity of PROW TM31 (where it is bisected by the proposed Sothern Link Road).

5.23-5.29 – The assessment of the TA with respect to the impact on the Brooks End level crossing suggests that development will not generate a significant increase in pedestrian movements, as most trips are assumed to be for leisure purposes, however this is not agreed with at this juncture. A national survey is used to show the purpose split of pedestrian trips, but this would vary by location; the percentage of leisure walks in a coastal town would likely be greater than indicated. Also, an equally applicable category would be ‘other including just walk’, which would increase the percentage share. Leisure walks would also have a larger catchment area as leisure walkers would typically walk further than for commuting, business, or shopping purposes – adjusted walking isochrones would bring a greater proportion of the development within the Minnis Bay catchment. Consequently, further clarification is required on the potential impact of development on the level crossing so that a necessary position can be agreed with the KCC PROW team/Network Rail.

Section 6 – Potential Impact

6.3-6.5 – The highway authority can confirm that the strategic modelling of highway impact has been undertaken using the council's own modelling tools, as such is consistent with those used to consider the impact from the Thanet Local Plan, however it is important to point out that this is a strategic tool and provides the basis for further detailed analysis of potential highway impact.

The proposed model network in figure 6.1 represents the extent of the coded SATURN network, however there are a number of local routes that are not represented within the model, the Garden Estate/Park Avenue/Brunswick Road/Stone Barn Avenue, all of which are potential rat run routes that are used when significant delays are experienced at Birchington Square. Therefore, the outputs from the modelling exercise need to be considered within this context. This adds significant weight to the need to manage impact at Birchington Square to discourage overbearing use of these largely residential streets, which will not be reflected within the SATURN modelling.

6.6 – A recent change in the status of the DCO at Manston Airport has ensued and the project is now subject to a further review and decision-making process. Therefore, the highway authority reserves the right to review the requirement for further sensitivity testing should the future of the Airport be clarified between now and the determination of this application.

6.8 – This section is relatively silent over the selection criteria for further detailed capacity analyses at specific junctions. Therefore, further commentary is required in relation to the methodology used to select these junctions for further assessment. A network diagram should be produced which shows the local highway network and where forecast highway impact will be experienced. Given that the Westgate Strategic housing allocation has also come forward to planning, it is recommended that a joint piece of work is produced to support the combined impact assessment.

6.12 – Whilst it is agreed that the 2031 scenario is likely to represent the worst case scenario in terms of traffic flow through most junctions within the local highway network, it is relevant to highlight that until the full range of highway infrastructure improvements identified within the Thanet Transport Strategy are practically delivered, some junctions such as Shottendane Road/Manston Road and others located along the Shottendane Road corridor may be adversely impacted by the delivery of infrastructure such as the Southern Link Road if left in their current form (prior to mitigation being introduced).

6.13 –The suggestion that the Southern link Road should in some way be delayed until 2025 is not adequately evidenced and as such not agreed at this stage. The initial view of the highway authority is that this piece of infrastructure is key in managing the impact of the development on the A28 (particularly the Square) and should be provided at the earliest possible juncture, with a review of any complimentary improvements on the Manston Road/Shottendane Road corridor. We would welcome further dialogue with the application in relation to this point.

6.14 –The assertion that the Columbus Avenue Extension scheme is in some way uncertain at this stage is not accepted. It remains a currently planned infrastructure project that was considered during the recent Local Plan examination. It is currently expected that in line with the Local Plan evidence base, that strategic sites are required to make an appropriate contribution towards the

delivery of this link, and this was underpinned by statements of common ground reached with the relevant site promoters. It is unclear whether the applicant is challenging the need to provide funding towards this link and the TA draws no conclusions with respect to this matter. Clarification is therefore required.

6.15 – It is important to highlight that the 2031 model scenario (with development) assumes that all Inner Circuit interventions are delivered, however it is essential that an agreement is reached with the applicant in relation to the apportioned funding as set out in comments relating to the draft heads of terms (above). Failure to agree an appropriate level of funding will cast doubt over the delivery of this infrastructure and as such the appropriateness of its inclusion within the modelling forecasts. Clarification is required.

6.21 – 6.22 - Minnis Road (Junction 1) - The modelling outputs suggest that this junction is likely to operate well within capacity in 2031, as such is unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the Minnis Road signals.

6.23-6.26 A28 - Signal Junction – See comments relating to 3.16-3.18 above. At face value, there are initial concerns over the potential resilience of this junction to accommodate additional traffic growth beyond that has been modelled.

6.29 - Acol Hill/Park Lane Roundabout – We disagree with the statement that this junction has been oversized, instead it is felt that it is being provided with the necessary level of capacity resilience.

6.30 – 6.32 - Shottendane Road/Manston Road. This capacity calculation only assesses the proposed junction as a roundabout, however further sensitivity testing may be required as the nature of this design is currently under review.

Whilst this junction model addresses a theoretical scenario where the junction is delivered in 2031 (with sufficient capacity to accommodate whole Local plan growth), this is dependent on all relevant highway-based contributions being secured from Strategic Sites such as Birchington. Until full clarity has been provided regarding the amount and nature of funding to be provided by the applicant, there is currently insufficient certainty that the funding package will be in place to deliver this improvement at the necessary juncture.

This section does not assess the impact of delivering the proposed southern link road in 2025 in a theoretical scenario where a junction improvement has not delivered in this location (i.e it remains a priority junction). Therefore, further sensitivity tests will need to be provided or further clarification in relation to the provision of necessary funding to deliver junction improvements in isolation, if necessary.

6.37-6.38 – Whilst it is agreed that it is reasonable to place an emphasis on development sites to mitigate their own impacts at this junction, given the fact that Westgate on Sea is also subject to a live planning application, a joint approach to mitigation with the Westgate site should be explored with relevant contributions agreed based on an agreed mitigation package that addresses the impact from both developments. Failure to do this may lead to there being insufficient funding for the highway authority to implement the necessary improvements.

6.41 – The Square - At this point, the highway authority is not convinced that lane simulation is an appropriate modelling tool to accurately assess the complex interactivity between the Mini-roundabout at the Square, priority working arrangement on Park Lane, the nearby pedestrian signals (A28) and blocking back from existing bus stop infrastructure located next to the Square (A28). It is necessary for the lane simulation modelling files to be provided to the highway authority to enable additional scrutiny over the stated outputs.

Taken at face value, the 2016 baseline outputs appear to show no delay on the A28 north east, whereas in practice this approach often queues back due to vehicle conflict between those travelling towards A28 within the Park Lane. In addition, the queuing on Park lane appears to be much more severe than officers experience of on-site observations would suggest. In practice traffic would simply seek alternative routes to the A28 via residential streets such as Stone Barn Avenue/Brunswick Road/Park Avenue (and others). This reduces the confidence in any future forecasts that are produced using this lane simulation model.

6.55 – The outputs suggesting that traffic volumes reduce within the 2026 interim scenario appear to be erroneous given that the development will generate additional traffic within the Local Highway network and no link road will have been delivered to redistribute traffic away from this part of the road network. Further investigation and commentary are required from the applicant regarding the results that have been presented.

Section 7 – Manston Airport DCO Sensitivity Test

Whilst we note the outputs provided in this section and agree in terms of likely impact, as stated previously in 6.6 we reserve the right to request further sensitivity tests, dependent on the outcome of the DCO process.

Section 8 – Mitigation

8.3-8.7 – Although this section discusses the provision of the internal link roads and Inner Circuit as mitigation for development traffic, there is no mention of a contribution to the Transport Strategy here. The only clarification on this point is provided within the Section 106 Heads of Terms document.

8.11 – The proposed contribution towards improvements to existing bus infrastructure is acknowledged, although the precise extents of such would need to be agreed for inclusion in the S106. We would recommend the improvement of existing stops on the A28, Minnis Road and Park Lane, as these all have the potential to serve the development site. Consideration should also be given to improving town centre stops where needed as a destination for local bus trips.

Although not discussed in this section it would be appropriate to address here the 164 two-way cycle movements generated by this development, identified previously in Table 5.4. As a significant majority of these trips would likely be either to the town centre or Minnis Bay, consideration should be given to identifying opportunities for additional cycle parking facilities in these locations.

Section 9 – Construction Traffic

9.4 – It is expected that construction access for the majority of the site will be directly off the A28, however routing for Phase 1B (112 dwellings) has been specified as via Spitfire Way/Manston Rd (confirmed in 9.19).

9.15 – The proposed delivery timings are considered acceptable (0900-1700), although once the proposed school is operational this may need to be adjusted to avoid the school peaks.

9.18 – The proposed highway condition report should be carried out in coordination with the District Highway Manager to fully ascertain existing highway conditions as a baseline and agree a suitable remediation strategy.

9.25 – The proposed construction vehicle numbers for inclusion within the CTMP is welcomed, although it would be strengthened by an indication of impact on the local network peaks

Access to the proposed school site

Situated within the proposed Phase 2B, the school generally is well located to enjoy access on foot or cycle from all phases of development, as well as the wider area, with the exception of Phase 3, which does not appear from the Phasing plan to be connected to the remainder of the site until the section of link road that falls within Phase 4 is complete. Without the submission of a clear schedule for infrastructure delivery at present, details of how Phase 3 is to be linked for other modes requires clarification. Positioned directly on the northern link road that connects the A28 and Minnis Road, the initial specification indicates that adequate walking and cycling facilities will be provided right up to the school land as shown on the illustrative masterplan. However, the link to Mill Row, which is likely to be well used for school access, could be more clearly defined. The Access and Movement Parameter plan simply shows the existing PROW but no additional routes that would accommodate desire lines to the school. The masterplan shows the upgraded PROW running almost alongside the school but does not establish any direct connections, apparently requiring pedestrians and cyclists to travel via a section of the northern link road, which could feasibly be avoided to reduce journey times.

Although this application is for access only, we would further expect the Access and Movement Parameter plan to indicate suitable crossing points along the link roads that would facilitate access to the school if approaching from the western side of the development.

The vehicular access to the school is positioned to preclude the build-up of cars in any adjacent streets, as long as adequate facility for dropping-off and picking-up are provided within the school land. It would appear that there is potential for staff parking to be moved further into what appears to be a deep plot of land for the school, in order to accommodate this. Given its proximity to the community uses, it may be worth considering combining the parking facilities of the two as the respective peak demand of the different uses are unlikely to occur at the same time and this could

reduce the overall land requirement for parking and the number of accesses needed off the future highway.

Further clarification is required in relation to bus service provision through the site, however it would be expected that regular bus services would be running within 400m of the school site in order to encourage sustainable travel.

Phasing Plan

In the absence of an infrastructure delivery schedule, we would like to highlight the following in the submitted phasing:

Phase 1B (112 dwellings) has the potential to generate additional traffic through Acol and Birchington Square unless the link to the A28 can be completed at the same time, rather than during Phase 2A. Separate emergency access to the development would also be required unless the southern link is completed in tandem.

Phase 3 (268 dwellings) has the potential to generate additional traffic through Birchington Square and the neighbouring residential streets of the Garden estate, unless the link to the A28 can be completed at the same time, rather than during Phase 4. Separate emergency access would also be required unless the northern link road is completed in tandem.

Consequently, we would welcome further discussion on these points.

Movement and Parameter Plan

In addition to other comments made pertaining to this document, the plan denotes a Strategic Link Road corridor with a deviation limit of +/- 10m, which is acceptable subject to agreement over the requirements of the corridor in line with our MRN process, as well as the inclusion of all adoptable infrastructure within its boundaries.

Framework Travel Plan

Generally, the highway authority is satisfied with the scope of the submitted Framework Travel Plan, although subject to further assessment of impact on the highway network we may require it to be monitored by this authority. Travel Plan monitoring in instances where one is required to offset any adverse impacts on the network would be subject to further assessment and a monitoring fee. Furthermore, we would welcome the inclusion of any additional 'hard' measures, notwithstanding the proposed car club spaces (subject to scheme details and locations on-site), to encourage modal shift away from the private car. Typically for larger housing developments sustainable measures such as electric cycle provision, cycle hire, cycle vouchers, electric pool cars, bus vouchers are included, and we would welcome further dialogue on this point.

In conclusion, it is recognised that a significant number of matters have been raised in relation to information submitted. Therefore, the highway authority recommend that a meeting is held with the applicant in order to seek positive resolutions on the matters raised. Until such time that these issues have been clarified or resolved, the highway authority wishes to lodge a holding objection to these development proposals.

In conclusion there are several issues that have been highlighted, that required a positive response and resolution. Until such time that these issues have been satisfactorily resolved, it is necessary to lodge a holding objection to the application with respect to Highway and Transportation matters.