

I write to you in respect of the email received Thursday, 20th January 2022. From the correspondence received, your email relates to the consultation response issued to Cheltenham Borough Council on the 1st November 2021 by Gloucestershire County Council in respect of application ref 21/02148/FUL. The application description is for the erection of 2 dwellings at Land East Of Leckhampton Reservoir Leckhampton Hill Cheltenham Gloucestershire. The following matters have been raised and will be addressed below:

- Claimed path across the site;
- Vehicle speeds of descending traffic along the frontage of the site;
- Available visibility for egressing vehicles onto Leckhampton Rd, particularly cyclists;
- Accident data in the vicinity of the site and the junction of Old Bath Rd with Leckhampton Rd;
- The use of banksmen by Severn Trent when egressing the site;
- Principle of use of the access for residential units and the impact onto Undercliff Avenue, Leckhampton Hill, Leckhampton Road and Old Bath Road.

I must note that the principle of development at this site for the erection up to 3no. dwellings has already been established under planning ref 20/01620/PIP which ultimately adds significant weight to our recommendation.

As per the Joint Core Strategy Policy INF1 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Where severe impacts attributed to the development can be considered likely, these must be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

In this instance, when I assessed the current planning application determined that the development, in light of its scale and likely impact on the road network, would not be severe in capacity terms nor be conducive to an unacceptable impact on highway safety. I have reviewed the case file; evidence presented by the applicant, yourself and members of the public, as well as carried out a site visit in the context of the expressed concerns. In this process, I conducted a hand held speed gun survey which the summary of the results is presented below on table 1. Based on my professional judgement and observations made, I do not find the evidence before me supports a recommendation of refusal.

With respect to the claimed path across the site, I have discussed this matter with the Local Planning Authority whom has confirmed that the planning application can be determined without prejudice to the consultation, and that the route could be diverted at a later stage pursuant the powers of the Town and Country Planning Act.

As mentioned, I have carried out a hand held speed survey and Gloucestershire County Council considers a speed survey to be relevant when acquired within the most recent 3 years. Anything beyond this time period may not be a true reflection of the existing occurrences. No relevant speed surveys were carried out at the vicinity of the site within this period, hence the need to carry out this assessment. The survey was carried out on the 4th February 2021 between 11:26am and 11:51am to ascertain speeds for descending traffic along the frontage of the site. The weather conditions were sunny but the road was wet as it had rained earlier in that day. 100 vehicle speeds were acquired during this period, and are presented in the table below, this survey provides an evidence led insight to local conditions.

**Table 1 - Speed measurements Leckhampton Rd (mph)**

|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 33 | 32 | 25 | 27 | 30 | 26 | 29 | 31 | 22 | 32 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

|    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 35 | 37 | 23 | 26 | 27 | 29 | 27 | 33 | 33 | 30 |
| 34 | 20 | 19 | 24 | 27 | 30 | 22 | 27 | 29 | 27 |
| 34 | 31 | 18 | 23 | 27 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 33 | 32 |
| 32 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 28 | 33 | 31 | 26 | 29 |
| 31 | 39 | 35 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 29 | 33 | 27 | 28 |
| 32 | 39 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 32 | 27 | 32 | 34 | 30 |
| 32 | 31 | 34 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 30 | 36 | 21 | 27 |
| 36 | 29 | 26 | 33 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 35 | 27 | 26 |
| 34 | 35 | 20 | 31 | 29 | 27 | 27 | 29 | 34 | 35 |

The outputs of the survey show an average speed of 30mph at the vicinity of the site, however in accordance with the DMRB guidance, where speed measurements have been taken either partially or entirely in wet weather conditions, 4kph should be added to the outputs for single carriageways, which equates to circa 2.4mph, making the acquired average speeds of 32mph. The 85th%ile speeds resulting from this would be 35mph which, in accordance with the guidance set in Manual for Streets, results in a necessary Y distance of 51 metres to the east off the site access. I can confirm that a visibility splay distance of 51 metres can be achieved to the edge of the carriageway east off the site access from a point 2.4m back the centre of the junction, therefore the Highway Authority is satisfied that there is sufficient visibility when egressing the site for both oncoming vehicles and cyclists. All results presented above are to the nearest mph.

In terms of westbound visibility off the site access, a measurement can be made to the centreline of the carriageway as vehicles are unlikely to overtake at this section due to the right turn access onto Old Bath Road. Leckhampton Rd is subject to a design speed of 30mph at the vicinity of the site, which in accordance with Manual for Streets guidance, is required to provide a visibility splay of 43m. It is clear that a distance of 43m can be achieved to the centre line of the carriageway on this basis.

With regards to the accident data at the vicinity of the site, the data within the most recent 5 years, which is an industry standard time period that deems the data relevant, shows a single incident occurred near the vicinity of the site. That incident was a rear shut incident on the Old Bath Road and does not suggest there is a poor safety record in the locality.



Based on the collision data presented before me, it is safe to conclude that there are no existing patterns indicative of problems in relation to the operation and safety of the local highways.

In relation to the use of banksman by Severn Trent, this company has its own individual Health and Safety requirements which is not relevant to the application.

Lastly, the principle of the use of the vehicular access for residential purposes has already been established under application ref 20/01620/PIP. I must note that this permission was for 3no. dwellings which in itself would result in a greater number of trips onto the network than currently proposed. A typical residential dwelling generates on average 4 to 5no. daily vehicle movements. The 7-day average daily traffic flow for Leckhampton Road is circa 6,849 vehicles, this development will add circa 10no. daily trips onto the network which represents a 0.15% capacity impact.

Whilst I appreciate your concerns and the submissions presented to me, it is not the view of the Highway Authority that this development should be refused on highways grounds, and consequently, will not need to amend the recommendation to the Local Planning Authority at this time.