

For and on behalf of
Keepmoat Homes Ltd

**Highways Summary Proof of Evidence of Miss Anna Meer BA (Hons) CMILT
Core Document 6.28a**

**Appeal against the refusal of
Full Planning Permission for 103 dwellings on
Field Reference Number 7108 at Eakring Road, Bilsthorpe, Nottinghamshire**

**INSPECTORATE REF: APP/B3030/W/20/3265876
PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 20/00873/FULM**




**Prepared by
Anna Meer
Sustainable Development and Delivery
DLP Planning Ltd
Sheffield**

April 2021

CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 EXPERIENCE.....	3
2.0 SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE	4

1.0 EXPERIENCE

- 1.1 My name is Anna Meer. I have a BA Honours Degree in Geography and am a Chartered Member of the Institute of Logistics and Transport (CMILT). I also hold the Road Safety Engineering (RoSPA) accreditation.
- 1.2 I am currently an Associate Director working for DLP Planning Ltd, which is a national planning consultancy. More specifically, I work within the Sustainable Development and Delivery (SDD) team within DLP, which specialises in highways and transportation planning. I head up the SDD team across offices in both Sheffield and Nottingham, whilst also providing support to our SDD team in Bristol. I have worked as a Transport Planner for over 16 years at multi-disciplinary companies, and highway consultancies. This has included undertaking work on behalf of both private and public sector clients on highways and transportation jobs across the UK.
- 1.3 The evidence I have prepared and provided for this appeal ((APP/B3030/W/20/3265876) against the refusal of Full Planning Permission for 103 dwellings on land to the east of Eakring Road, Bilsthorpe, Nottinghamshire is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

Signed	
Name	Anna Meer BA (Hons) CMILT
Position	Associate Director, DLP Planning Ltd
Date	12/04/2021

2.0 SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

- 2.1 My evidence seeks to address the highways and transport issues associated with the proposed scheme.
- 2.2 There was no objection to the scheme from the Local Highway Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council), subject to several planning conditions being imposed.
- 2.3 However, whilst the Local Highway Authority raised no objection to the scheme, the Decision Notice includes reference to a highways related matter in its reason for refusal.
- 2.4 My proof has therefore been prepared following the Case Management Conference (CMC) held on 15th March 2021. At the CMC, the Planning Inspector identified that in addition to the highways related reason for refusal from the Local Planning Authority, other highway matters were also raised by local resident third parties. In light of this, it was agreed that the highways Proof of Evidence (PoE) would be prepared to address the highways element of the reason for refusal and also those highway matters raised by third parties.
- 2.5 My evidence makes reference to previous work undertaken by Travis Baker in preparing the Transport Assessment (Core Document CD1.15), and associated documents in support of the planning application.
- 2.6 The Decision Notice raises concern in relation to the provision of triple tandem parking spaces as follows:

“..... significant proportion of the proposed four bed units being served by three parking spaces in tandem. The Local Planning Authority consider that this will lead to parking on street rather than in plot which consequently will detrimentally affect the efficiency of the internal highways network.”

- 2.7 In considering the above, I have reviewed the Newark & Sherwood Local Development Framework “Residential Cycle and Car Parking Standards & Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document” (final draft January 2021) at Section 4 of my proof. To reiterate, Key principle 2 sets out how in relation to tandem car parking:

“Tandem car parking arrangements can form part of a car parking strategy but will not be encouraged to be the only or predominant design solution”

- 2.8 Whilst the above guidance states that tandem parking will not be “encouraged” it is not stated as being prohibited. It is therefore agreed that tandem parking should not be a predominant design solution, but instead, can be adopted as part of other parking layouts such as garages, courtyards or on-street parking bays. Given the proposed layout allows for 20 instances of tandem parking bays to be provided on-plot, and that the scheme allows for 103 dwellings in its entirety, I do not see this as an over reliance on tandem parking provision or the “dominant” parking option.

- 2.9 I therefore conclude that the provision of triple tandem parking spaces at 20 plots within the site does not conflict with local policy or guidance.
- 2.10 With regards to the utilisation of triple tandem parking bays, within my proof I have provided several examples of recently consented similar scale residential schemes, and where these schemes are built out; I have reviewed how utilised the tandem parking spaces are. The photographic montage within my proof contains shows several instances whereby triple tandem parking is indeed utilised. Whilst it is not possible to tell whether the garage is indeed occupied, it does show that both driveway spaces are used, and no adjacent overspill / on-street parking occurs.
- 2.11 I therefore do not agree that residents would simply choose to park on-street rather than within the curtilage of their own plot, and agree with the conclusion of the Local Highway Authority consultation comments where they did not raise any concern over tandem parking being provided.
- 2.12 Turning to the issue of tandem parking leading to on-street parking, as part of the site visits made to review recently consented / similar scale schemes as outlined above, I have also taken photographic evidence of on-street parking to assist in visualising how the road network may still operate under such conditions. My photographic evidence shows how even with sporadic and intermittent on-street parking which is typical of residential streets, vehicles are still able to pass.
- 2.13 In order to further demonstrate how the internal road network could operate efficiently with on-street parking present, I have included within my proof, **Drawing Number NTTS5224-3PD-001**, which shows how a Phoenix 2-23W refuse collection vehicle could negotiate the internal layout, even when on-street parking in the vicinity of the triple tandem bay plots occurs. This shows how the refuse is still able to manoeuvre around the parked vehicle, and in my opinion has no significant impact upon the efficient operation of the highway network.
- 2.14 To conclude, based upon my review of the work undertaken to date in preparation of the planning application, and the additional evidence I have sought as part of my proof of evidence, I agree with the Local Highway Authority that there are no highways related reason to refuse this scheme, subject to the agreement of suitably worded planning conditions.

BEDFORD / SDD / SPRU

4 Abbey Court, Fraser Road
Priory Business Park, Bedford. MK44 3WH
bedford@dlpconsultants.co.uk
01234 832 740

BRISTOL / SDD / SPRU

Broad Quay House (6th Floor)
Prince Street, Bristol. BS1 4DJ
bristol@dlpconsultants.co.uk
01179 058 850

EAST MIDLANDS / SDD

1 East Circus Street, Nottingham
NG1 5AF
nottingham@dlpconsultants.co.uk
01158 966 622

LEEDS

Princes Exchange
Princes Square, Leeds. LS1 4HY
leeds@dlpconsultants.co.uk
01132 805 808

LONDON

108 Clerkenwell Workshops,
31 Clerkenwell Close, London, EC1R 0AT
london@dlpconsultants.co.uk
020 3761 5390

MILTON KEYNES

Midsummer Court, 314 Midsummer Boulevard
Milton Keynes. MK9 2UB
miltonkeynes@dlpconsultants.co.uk
01908 440 015

SHEFFIELD / SDD / SPRU

Ground Floor, V1 Velocity Village
Tenter Street, Sheffield. S1 4BY
sheffield@dlpconsultants.co.uk
0114 228 9190

RUGBY / SDD

18 Regent Place, Rugby, Warwickshire
CV21 2PN
rugby.enquiries@dlpconsultants.co.uk
01788 562 233

