

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

LAND OFF MOORTHORPE WAY
APPLICATION REF. 19/03143/FUL

SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE ON HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

REF CD4.12.2

TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

LAND OFF MOORTHORPE WAY
APPLICATION REF. 19/03143/FUL

SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE ON HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

REF CD4.12.2

Nottingham
Waterfront House, Station Street, Nottingham NG2 3DQ
T: 0115 924 1100

December 2020

DOCUMENT ISSUE RECORD

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Document Number: | OWL-BWB-GEN-XX-RP-TR-003-Highways PoE Summary (Ref. CD4.12.2) |
| BWB Reference: | LDP2266_PoE Summary |

Notice

This document has been prepared for the sole use of the Client in accordance with the terms of the appointment under which it was produced. BWB Consulting Limited accepts no responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this document by any third party. No part of this document shall be copied or reproduced in any form without the prior written permission of BW

- 1.1 I am Matthew Addison, the author of this report. I am a Transport Planner and Associate Director at BWB Consulting Limited (BWB), an integrated engineering and environmental consultancy that delivers multi-disciplinary engineering solutions to the property, development and construction industry.
- 1.2 BWB was first appointed by Avant Homes (England) Ltd in February 2019 to advise upon transport matters in relation to a proposed residential development on the appeal site. The appeal site is located to the west of Moorthorpe Gate in Owlthorpe, Sheffield. With regards to this planning appeal I will be providing evidence in relation to transport on behalf of the appellants, Avant Homes (England) Ltd.
- 1.3 I am well acquainted with the Appeal Site and the surrounding highway network, having visited the site and reviewed video footage from the traffic surveys.
- 1.4 There is no highways-related reason for refusal of the planning application and all key highway-related items have been agreed with Sheffield City Council (the local highways and planning authority) as part of the Statement of Common Ground. The main issues identified by the Inspector at the Pre-Inquiry meeting did not raise highways as a main issue. The purpose of my proof is to respond to the issues raised by local residents during the planning application and appeal process.
- 1.5 The appeal proposal is for a residential development of 72 dwellings ranging from two to five-bed in size. The planning application sought approval for 74 units. The minor amendment to the scheme is unrelated to highways matters. Vehicle access continues to be proposed from the existing three-arm roundabout, which serves Owlthorpe Medical Centre, off Moorthorpe Gate. The amendment to the site plan does not affect the results of my assessment as the revised scheme proposes a reduced number of dwellings.
- 1.6 In Chapter 2 of my proof, I explain the reasoning underpinning the scope of the Transport Assessment (TA) and confirm that this was scoped with highways officers at SCC. As part of the scoping exercise, we agreed the methodology used to calculate the trip generation and distribution used to inform the TA study area junctions. I explain the reasoning why the Moss Way/Moorthorpe Way junction was not included in the study area, on the basis only 7, 6 and 4 two-way vehicles are expected to route via this junction in the weekday morning peak hour, the highest period for trip generation. I also clarify the reason why the Saturday assessment was not included in the original scope of the TA and confirm that this was subsequently undertaken in response to local resident concerns.
- 1.7 In Chapter 3 of my proof, I address the resident concerns relating to the operation of local highway network junctions. I identify the data upon which the traffic models were based and explain that base models were developed and validated against actual conditions using queue length survey information and video footage from the surveys. The methodology applied is considered very robust. I go on to explain that the modelled flows are also very robust. They include background traffic growth projections on the local highway network, which were applied using local growth factors from the National

Trip End Model (NTEM) modified in the Trip End Model Presentation Programme (TEMPro). In addition to this, the opening year modelled flows also include the traffic projections for Housing Sites C and D demonstrating that the assessment is again very robust.

- 1.8 I go onto explain the results of the off-site junction modelling assessments, explaining the thresholds used for the LinSig and Junctions 9 modelling software. These were used to assess the impact at the Donetsk Way/Moorthorpe Gate signalised junction and Donetsk Roundabout respectively. The results demonstrate that the junctions will be able to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in the future year accounting for the cumulative increases in traffic associated with background traffic growth, committed developments and proposed development traffic.
- 1.9 The results of these assessments with the inclusion of traffic flows on top, demonstrate that the junctions would be able to accommodate the forecast cumulative demand at the opening year with some reserve operational capacity.
- 1.10 In Chapter 3, I also address the perceived road safety issues associated with parking along Moorthorpe Way adjacent to the Donetsk Way Tram Stop. I explain that the appeal site is located within walking distance of the tram stop and that only 10% of the proposed development is expected to route via Moorthorpe Way. I also show that there are no existing records of collisions being reported in the vicinity of the parking along Moorthorpe Way, suggesting there is no existing road safety issue on this section of the network. There is also double yellow lining present at the Moorthorpe Gate/Moorthorpe Way junction prohibiting parking that might prevent the safe movement of traffic.
- 1.11 In the same chapter, I go onto review the collision records at the Moss Way/Moorthorpe Way junction, which was omitted from the TA study area for reasons outlined above. The records show that between January 2014 and December 2018 a total of 8 personal injury collisions were reported at the junction including three in 2014, none in 2015, one in 2016, two in 2017 and two in 2018. On review of the records, I conclude that there is no common pattern with the collisions that would suggest the junction is unsafe with the contributory factors pointing to driver error. Furthermore, the proposed development is not expected to add a material number of trips to the junction.
- 1.12 In Chapter 4 of my proof, I demonstrate that the appeal site is accessible by public transport with a high-quality walk route to the Donetsk Way Tram Stop, which is located on the Stagecoach Supertram Blue Route. This route typically provides high frequency (5 trams per hour in each direction) services between Halfway and Malin Bridge with key employment opportunities and services accessible in Sheffield City Centre in approximately 28 minutes. I quantify the non-car trip generation of the development and show that a maximum demand of 12 departing trips on the tram during the morning peak hour is likely to be generated. I explain that this equates to an average of 2.4 additional passengers per tram assuming all travel in the direct of the city centre. I conclude that this is unlikely to have a noticeable impact on the capacity of the existing tram network. The Appellant is also making a financial contribution to South Yorkshire Public Transport Executive (SYPTe) for improvements to facilities at Donetsk Way Trams Stop via the Section 106 Agreement.

- 1.13 In Chapter 4, I also include a detailed review of published policy and guidance in respect to walk distances to public transport stops. I use this to demonstrate that local bus and tram stops are within a walkable distance of the site. My conclusions are consistent with paragraph 5.2.9 of the *'Housing Sites (C, D, E), Moorthorpe Way, Owlthorpe Planning and Design Brief'* (July 2014; Updated November 2017) and paragraph 7.54 of the SoCG, both of which consider the site is within reach of high frequency bus and tram services.
- 1.14 In Chapter 5 of my proof, I consider the comprehensive development of the wider site from a transport perspective. I reiterate that there is no highway reason for refusal in this regard or anything disputed in the SoCG with SCC and that this review has been undertaken for completeness. In response to the consideration of the cumulative traffic impacts associated with Housing Sites C & D, I reiterate that the TA has accounted for the traffic impacts of these sites in the modelling assessments at opening year. The modelling assessments presented in the TA demonstrate that the cumulative traffic of all three sites coming forward can be accommodated on the local highway network without the need for mitigation.
- 1.15 Thereafter in Chapter 5, I explain why a link road through the site is not a necessary piece of infrastructure. As above, the TA demonstrates that the cumulative traffic of all three sites coming forward can be accommodated on the local highway network without the link road. I also refer to page 65 of the Committee Report and paragraph 7.60 of the SoCG, which confirms that "the link road is not required and highways capacity terms" and goes further to suggest that "if the link road were provided there is a likelihood that traffic would divert to this route" and "in addition to the negative amenity impacts of through traffic routing through housing areas it would also be likely to create capacity problems when traffic re-joins the main route". I confirm that the lack of a secondary access point to the wider site is not a material concern and that there is no policy or guidance requiring this based on the number of dwellings proposed. I also provide evidence that the design of Moorthorpe Gate and the roundabout adjacent to the site is sufficient to accommodate bus access into the site. Subject to demand, SYPTE has also confirmed that they "accept the principle that the bus route could be diverted at a future date".
- 1.16 Finally, in Chapter 5, I provide evidence showing that there are walkable amenities located within two kilometres of the appeal site. This is consistent with the Planning Policy Guidance 13, which is also referenced in 'Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot' (CIHT, 2000) and has been corroborated by WYG in their paper 'How far do people walk?' (2015) based on National Travel Survey (NTS) data. I therefore conclude that the location of the appeal site would support healthy lifestyles and are consistent with paragraph 91 of the NPPF.
- 1.17 In conclusion, my evidence reaffirms that there are no grounds for highways-related reasons for refusal, which is consistent with original recommendation of the case officer and has been agreed in the SoCG.



BETTER SOLUTIONS, INTELLIGENTLY ENGINEERED

