

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT
HIGHWAY REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT:	Bassetlaw	Date received	12/04/2018
OFFICER:	Mandy Freeman		
PROPOSAL:	Outline planning application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for layout and scale) for residential development of 10 dwellings.	D.C. No.	B/18/00342/OUT
LOCATION:	Woodlea, 55 Bawtry Road, Blyth, Worksop, S81 8HJ		
APPLICANT:	Messrs John & Alan Orange and Webster		

It is noted that access is a reserved matter but layout is not. Details of the latter will include buildings, routes and open spaces within the development and the way they are laid out in relation to buildings and spaces outside the development. It is hard to see how layout can therefore be considered without taking into account access.

It must be demonstrated that the layout is sufficient to accommodate a refuse vehicles. In accordance with Bassetlaw District Council's Waste Storage and Collection Guidance this would be a vehicle of the following dimensions:

- a length of 11.90 metres
- a width of 2.50 metres
- a wheelbase of 6.50 metres
- a turning circle of 22.07 metres

The Highway Authority is fairly certain that dust cart cannot be safely accommodated from the A614 Bawtry Road and this would be the case for similar sized delivery and service vehicles.

The layout does not include a footway on the northern side or around three quarters of the turning head. It would therefore operate as a shared surface street. In traditional street layouts, footways and carriageways are separated by a kerb. In a street with a shared surface, this demarcation is absent so pedestrians and vehicles share the same space. Manual for Streets acknowledges the importance of designing shared surface arrangements such that they are suitable for blind or partially-sighted people because conventional kerbs are commonly used to aid their navigation. It is therefore important that shared surface schemes include an alternative means for visually-impaired people to navigate by. When designing shared surface schemes, careful attention to detail is required to avoid other problems, such as undifferentiated surfaces leading to poor parking behaviour and vulnerable road users feeling threatened by having no space protected from vehicles. The road layout would usually be much more informal with variable widths or angular in a mews court type development. They often work best in environments where on street parking is controlled or restricted to designated areas.

Should the applicant wish to continue with the principle of not providing footways or only providing footways on one side of a street, the Highway Authority will require the application to be supported by a Quality Audit as outlined in Manual for Streets, Manual for Streets 2: Wider Application of the Principles, Local Transport Note 1/08 and Traffic Advisory Leaflet 5/11

demonstrating that the requirements of non-motorised users have been considered and satisfactorily addressed.

The lack of a footway or service strip on the north side of the access road would restrict visibility for vehicles emerging from private drives. This may be addressed by setting back plot frontages to create visibility splays. However, this is not going to be possible at least in the case of plot1 where the house would lie within the splay.

The proposed road layout fails to demonstrate sufficient space to accommodate the swept path of the largest vehicle likely to regularly visit, would afford restricted visibility for drivers emerging from accesses, and makes inadequate provision for pedestrians with a consequential risk to road safety. The proposed development is therefore contrary to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Frameworks. For these reasons, the Highway Authority recommends that the application be refused.

Martin Green
Principal Officer
27th April 2018