



**Canterbury City Council**

**Highways and Transportation**

Ashford Highway Depot

4 Javelin Way

Ashford

TN24 8AD

**Tel:** 03000 418181

**Date:** 26 April 2019

**Application - CA/17/01383/OUT**

**Location - Land at Sturry/Broad Oak, Sturry**

**Proposal - Outline application (with all matters reserved) for the development of up to 650 houses and associated community infrastructure comprising primary school, community building, public car park and associated amenity space, access, parking and landscaping; and detailed/full application for the construction of part of the Sturry Link Road and a local road from the Sturry Link Road to Shalloak Road.**

Thank you for your further consultation in relation to the above planning application. I have the following comments to make with respect to highway matters: -

### **Base Traffic Flows**

The base flows have been updated to 2018 using unspecified TEMPRO growth factors and we would request clarity on the rate used. The flow figures shown in Appendix B for the A291 in both the AM and PM are demonstrated as being lower in 2018 than 2015 having had TEMPRO growth applied. This would not appear to be correct and an explanation is requested.

### **TRIP Generation**

The subject of rates and levels of development associated with committed development have been subject to earlier discussions and are agreed. The trip rates associated with the primary school have been reviewed and my own assessment concludes that the rates demonstrated in Table 2.3 are agreed. The additional entry is acknowledged and associated internalisation of 45% of traffic is agreed.

As presented, it is unclear as to the number of movements that have been allocated to each of the elements of the development. Summary tables should be presented to clearly show the number of trips being generated from both the Broad Oak and Sturry sites to enable the junction and flows to be properly reviewed. For avoidance of doubt these should include; for Broad Oak, Residential and Employment. For Sturry, Residential, Community building and parking (including that for the train station) and the School (including staff).

## **Network assumptions**

The network assumption has been agreed earlier in collaboration with colleagues from our Major Projects Team. For clarity this includes all those listed in section 2.2.11 of the updated Transport Assessment.

## **Phasing of Development**

Clarification is requested as to how many homes have been included prior to the opening of the link road. The 70 houses per annum predicted would allow for 280 homes not the 325 suggested. Assessing at 2024 would presumably enable 420 homes. The previously agreed residential departure trip rate of 0.295 would appear to show that 278 homes have been included in the pre-link road analysis. Assuming 325 is the number of homes then 96 departures would be anticipated. It will need to be made clear as to whether this figure is for both applications or solely that of land at Sturry.

AM peak analysis shows 569 movements towards Broad Oak with development and the link road in place. 875 movements are demonstrated towards Broad Oak prior to link road completion compared with the 798 movements of the 2015 observed figures. It is however clearly demonstrated that the introduction of the proposed link road should significantly reduce the number of movements through Broad Oak. Assuming 325 is the number of homes delivered prior to the link road it is suggested that at most an additional 24 movements could be heading towards Broad Oak on top of those demonstrated in the TA. This would take the figure to 900, a temporary increase of 12%. Considering this against the benefits delivered by this developments ability to complete the link road it is concluded that the negative impacts should be tolerated for the short term. However, when considering the current exceeding capacity and crash data of the Sweechgate/A291 junction, measures to reduce speeds in the vicinity of the existing junction should be introduced prior to any occupations.

The Highway Authority will required further clarification of financing and phasing options for the delivery of the relief road on which this allocation is dependant. Security of finance will be required for the delivery of the County Councils element of the scheme, along with land security in respect of the remaining link road through the application. Guarantees would be required through any Section 106 agreement that ensure no development can occur without mechanisms for the completion of the Sturry Relief Road in its entirety. Such guarantees would need to include provision for the land required for the Relief Road to the Highway Authority at no cost should development be granted but not proceed.

The Highway Authority also requires this application to be heard at planning committee prior to that of the Broad Oak application 18/00868. Should this (Sturry) application be refused then the Highway Authority's recommendation for the Broad Oak application 18/00868 would also be to refuse. This would be on the grounds of uncertainty of the Sturry Relief Road and resultant severity of congestion and safety concerns at the A28/A291.

To be clear our position is that the Broad Oak application cannot avoid a Highway Authority refusal without approval of this application.

## **Traffic Impact of the Wider Network**

The analysis provided for the Broad Oak Road/St Stephen's roundabout and Broad Oak Road/Farleigh Road has been reviewed. It is agreed that the development does have an impact on both junctions, but the demonstration of them being over capacity is not entirely the doing of this application. Notwithstanding the above, the junctions are demonstrated as over capacity and queues of 78 vehicles on the Broad Oak Road and delays of 127 seconds on the St

Stephen's Road are not insignificant. The existing roundabout is tightly constrained with few obvious solutions for physical improvement. It is therefore suggested a conversion of this junction to signal control be reviewed. Design and assessment of a signal controlled crossing should be prepared which includes pedestrian crossing facilities on the Broad Oak Road and St Stephens Road SW arms. The applications would not be expected to fully fund any identified improvement scheme only a contribution mitigating their impact.

## **Popes Lane**

The 2018 PICARDY assessment of the Popes Lane/A291 junction demonstrates significant delay and queuing in the AM peak. It is accepted however that the introduction of the link road and A28/A291 junction improvements are forecast to improve journey times and as a consequence reduce the likelihood of using Popes Lane. The submitted junction analysis and associated flow diagrams submitted do not appear to include the Popes Lane junction and this information is requested so that it can be reviewed.

## **Public Transport**

Mitigation would be sought by way of householder public transport vouchers to encourage new residents to take up sustainable transport options. These will help to improve the viability of additional public transport services and reduce vehicle trip generation and associated air quality impacts on the A28.

The locations of the bus stops are now agreed as appropriate.

## **Land at Sturry**

The access junctions have been reviewed against the flows demonstrated in Figures 2.6 and 2.7. As mentioned above, details of the trip generation for this element should also be presented to enable the results to be properly considered. Junction 2 figures would appear to be on the low side considering the expectation that the primary school and community facilities would be located off this access.

## **Station Parking**

The movement of the station facility is welcome and the proposed location agreed.

## **Walking**

Comments regarding public rights of way improvements will be provided from the appropriate department with KCC. In general the layout of both applications is well thought through and permeable for pedestrians.

The application includes a controlled pedestrian crossing of the internal spine road and is well located at the desire line for the school.

## **Cycling**

Connections between the Broad Oak and Sturry developments will be considered in the detailed elements of each application.

It is acknowledged that improvements are provided through the length of the spine road and viaduct to the A28. Further improvements would also be provided towards the Vauxhall Road/Broad Oak Road roundabout. Off-site connections would however be required to ensure a direct connection to the Stour riverside cycle route from Vauxhall Road. This would facilitate the most direct access to Canterbury West station. Contributions for cycling should be expected to enable this connection mitigating the site allocations impact upon the St Stephens roundabout. Further contribution would be sought to enable the completion of the Mayton Lane and University of Kent. In total an amount of £160,000.00 is requested between the two applications. Understanding that the Sturry application is providing considerable stretches of strategic cycling facilities adjacent to its Spine Road it is recommended that the Broad Oak allocation provides the majority off site contributions of £100,000.

In respect of the Sturry application it is noted that a continuous cycle facility is available on the Southern side of the spine road. Sections of facility on the approach to the Eastern roundabout are also welcomed. The design has been reviewed and agreed as appropriate. A note is made in respect of any forthcoming reserved matters application; it is requested that any minor roads connecting to the spine road have raised crossings and priority stop lines that give priority to cyclists crossing them.

It had been anticipated that the two parts of the allocation would be connected with a cycle route penetrating the South side of the Broad Oak site and North of the Sturry Site. This would provide access to the shared use route on the southern side of the Sturry spine road. Whilst a cycle link is shown to the South East corner of the Broad Oak site, it is unclear how the route is proposed to permeate through the Sturry site to connect to the proposed Toucan crossing. It is recommended that a condition be placed upon the development to ensure the link is secured.

## **Street Hierachy**

The indicative hierarchy, as demonstrated in the D&A "Street typology plan" is appropriate but will require more detailed evaluation at the Reserved Matters stage. Elements of some Primary access roads should include a 3 metre shared footway/cycleway as a minimum. The pedestrian and cycling provision in close proximity to the school will require an additional 0.5m to accommodate the heavy flows. For the avoidance of doubt street designs must comply with Kent Design Standards.

## **Parking**

The correct parking standards have been correctly referenced in section 6 of the submitted Design and Access Statement. The accompanying Transport Assessment correctly assumes that the Rural/Suburban provision parameters will be applicable to this site. It should also be noted that EV charging provision in accordance with Canterbury City Councils Air Quality Action Plan would also be applicable.

## **Traffic Modelling Scenario Development**

We are unable to find the updated VISSIM forecasting report and request that this is sent for review.

## **Concluding summary**

Further information has been requested and should be submitted before the Highway Authority will be in a position to make a final determination. Assurances are required to ensure that the Local Plan Site 2 infrastructure policy requirement to deliver the Sturry Relief Road is delivered before consent should be considered.

INFORMATIVE: It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure , before the development hereby approved is commenced, that all necessary highway approvals and consents where required are obtained and that the limits of highway boundary are clearly established in order to avoid any enforcement action being taken by the Highway Authority.

Across the county there are pieces of land next to private homes and gardens that do not look like roads or pavements but are actually part of the road. This is called 'highway land'. Some of this land is owned by The Kent County Council (KCC) whilst some are owned by third party owners. Irrespective of the ownership, this land may have 'highway rights' over the topsoil.

Information about how to clarify the highway boundary can be found at

<https://www.kent.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/what-we-look-after/highway-land/highway-boundary-enquiries>

The applicant must also ensure that the details shown on the approved plans agree in every aspect with those approved under such legislation and common law. It is therefore important for the applicant to contact KCC Highways and Transportation to progress this aspect of the works prior to commencement on site.

Yours faithfully

**Colin Finch**

Principal Transport & Development Planner