



**Canterbury City Council**

**Highways and Transportation**

Ashford Highway Depot

4 Javelin Way

Ashford

TN24 8AD

**Tel:** 03000 418181

**Date:** 11 February 2020

**Application - CA/19/00557/OUT**

**Location - Land south of Osborne Gardens, Herne Bay**

**Proposal - Outline application for proposed residential development for up to 180 dwellings with site access, open space and associated infrastructure following demolition of 2 no. dwellings.**

Thank you for your further consultation to the Highway Authority on the above application for which we have the following observations and comments on the submitted Technical Note on transport.

### **Development proposals**

#### **Parking**

The applicant has acknowledged that there will be a need for further parking provision however has not provided any useful indication as to what the provision will be other than to meet the KCC standards within IGN3. It is recommended that the applicant submits a propose parking strategy for clarity. Understanding that this is an outline application, should the applicant not provide this then a tightly worded condition would be required.

The applicant has not confirmed their proposals for EV charging. A further condition will therefore be required to ensure that all on plot parking is provided with external sockets available for EV charging, along with 10% of any parking associated with flats to have active EV charging points.

#### **Refuse Servicing**

A condition will be required to submit a refuse strategy drawing demonstrating vehicle tracking for an 11.4m refuse vehicle including demonstration of maximum carrying distances of 55m compliant to the Planning Authorities policy. Any drawing submitted for reserved matters should demonstrate the collection points.

#### **HGV Construction Traffic Routing**

Demonstration of 12m rigid delivery lorry movements has now been provided along with a detailed assessment of suggested alternative solutions. It is also recognised that a further vehicle parking study was completed in December 2019 to assess the likely demand accessibility of the approach roads. This was completed between 14:00 and 15:00 and has been compared to the earlier study for Terminus Road. It is however incorrect to approximate the levels of parking one road to that of another. There could be a number of variables to a road layout such as the availability of off-street parking, proximity and accessibility to differing

shops or services that vary the peak demand times. The note submitted suggests that peak levels of parking recorded for Osborne Gardens would not exceed 28 at a time of 15:30. Having inspected the site on the 5<sup>th</sup> February I observed 34 vehicles parked at 10:00. Using the applicants estimation formula on the difference between my observed 34 and the applicants estimated 16 parked vehicles at 10:00am would result in 59 vehicles being parked in the applicants suggested 15:30 peak. The applicant has also assumed onsite provision being 170 spaces. Using only one side of the road this would require a maximum length of 1020 metres of road to be available on one side with the road itself measuring approximately 710m in length. On the basis of my own observations I would consider that parking at its peak would be nearing capacity.

### **Construction routing**

Option 1. The submitted transport note acknowledges that there is insufficient road width for construction vehicles to egress from Osborne gardens, Eastern end, as originally proposed and subsequently discounted.

Option 2. The right turn manoeuvre into Osborne Gardens is extremely tight and would require full width of the road. In addition, there is limited forward visibility and a potential safety concern for slow moving right turning vehicles. TRO's would be necessary throughout Osborne Gardens that would require ongoing inspection and potential enforcement.

Option 3. As above this route would require TRO's to be in place for Osborne Gardens but also the narrow roads to the East through Reculver. The egress movement from Osborne Gardens also demonstrates a striking of the protective bollards on the Northern pavement.

Option 4. The proposed access through Puffin Road would utilise narrower streets unsuitable for the volume of construction traffic necessary for this development. The volume of construction traffic for the proposed development is incomparable to the approved 40 home extension of the existing settlement.

Option 5. The proposed route through the allocated site to the East is considered to be the most safe and appropriate that can be reasonably achieved. The applicant previously had ownership of the land over which the route would follow and therefore has had every ability to secure it. The route avoids the areas of safety and amenity concern and as such is the required construction routing of the Highway Authority.

In conclusion the Highway Authority remains of the opinion that routing construction traffic through the residential streets to the North of the site cannot be satisfactorily achieved and would cause unnecessary and avoidable harmful impact to highway safety and amenity. The site forms part of the wider allocation and construction traffic can be accommodated through the wider allocation land with direct links to the strategic network. Any other alternatives would clearly cause unnecessary and avoidable negative impact and must therefore be discounted. Construction traffic must therefore come through the allocated and to the East as envisaged when the site was allocated.

Further consideration has been given in respect of providing clarity on the anticipated trigger at which construction access through the Taylor Wimpey site should be available. It is considered that a trigger should be set for construction access to be available to this applicant prior to the completion of the first phase (194) dwellings or opening of the school, whichever is the sooner. This will therefore enable construction access to be sooner than previously proposed and provides a further certainty as to the timescale expected.

**Mickleburgh Hill/Reculver Road Junction-** The applicant has responded positively by including the zebra crossing as requested. The junction improvements will be required by condition as a Section 278 scheme.

**Reculver Road** – The applicant has presented a scheme to reduce the speeds through Beltinge High Street and improve the pedestrian environment and permeability through the locality. Drawings S451-PL-SK-009 to 020 are generally agreed however it is considered that area to the South of Maritime Avenue would not meet the current criteria for a 20 MPH zone. It is therefore recommended that drawings SK-017 to 20 be amended to remove the 20MPH infrastructure and that drawing 17 includes the provision of the 20MPH gateway in close proximity to Maritime Avenue. Details of the proposed gateway feature will need to be approved. Following those suggested amendments to the drawings we will require a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit to be completed for the scheme prior to us making final comments. The scheme will be expected to be delivered by condition through a Section 278 agreement and prior to any occupation.

**Reculver Road/Sea View Road junction** – The applicant has proposed that a mini roundabout be installed at this location and it is agreed that this would offer an improvement to the current layout. As above a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit will be required at this stage and to be delivered through a Section 278 agreement.

**Junctions of Reculver Road/Sea View, King Edward Avenue/Mickleburgh Hill and Reculver Road/Blacksole Bridge capacity assessments** – Further information regarding the capacity assessments for these junctions as been submitted and reviewed. Following review, it is agreed that no further testing is required on the existing layouts.

### **Walking and Cycling**

The proposed 20MPH scheme largely addresses the concerns raised leaving one issue remaining. A further crossing is necessary to complete the pedestrian link on the South side of Blacksole bridge. A pavement extension of approximately 10 metres is required on the East side of the Margate Road to avoid pedestrians having to walk in the road in an area where this development will substantially increase the vehicular traffic flows. A drawing of the scheme will need to be included within the application with the improvements made prior to the access road to Osborne Gardens being opened.

### **Terminus Drive**

Having reviewed the comments and drawings provided, it is agreed that the closing of Terminus Road to the North is difficult to achieve due to an inability to provide a turning head. The suggested one-way South Bound only movements could be considered as an alternative however is likely to increase speeds through the route. The intention of stopping up of the road is to deter additional traffic associated with the application from using Terminus Road due to restricted visibility at its Northern end. It is considered that a turning head could be provided South of Holmscroft Road on Terminus Road and that this would address the concern. A drawing is therefore requested that demonstrates that approach.

### **Concluding Summary**

The Highway Authority retains a **holding objection** on the application subject to further information being provided. On receipt of the above requested information, we would be hopeful of being in a position to issue our final response detailing the required outline conditions and Section 106 contributions.

Resolution for this applications contribution towards the Herne Relief Road must also be secured prior to determination. This is again not mentioned in the application submission.

Taylor Wimpey have been requested to make payment of the full allocation requirement for contributions on the understanding that payments will be equalised through private negotiations. Unless we receive assurance that this application has appropriately contributed to the Herne Relief Road, at the appropriate time, then this application should be deemed non-compliant with site policy SP3.

Yours faithfully

**Colin Finch**

Principal Transport & Development Planner