

To: Staffordshire Moorlands, DCM
 Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
 Moorlands House
 Stockwell Street
 Leek
 ST13 6HQ

Applicant: BLOOR HOMES NW
 EMERY PLANNING MR JOHN COXON
 UNITS 2 - 4 SOUTH PARK COURT
 MACCLESFIELD
 SK118BS

Application Type: OUTLINE

Officer: David Plant

Application No: SMD2021/0610

Date: 19-OCT-2021

Date Received: 28-SEP-2021

Road No: A0521

Particulars of Development:

OUTLINE FOR UP TO 228 DWELLINGS WITH ACCESS CONSIDERED (ALL OTHER MATTERS RESERVED)

Location of Development:

LAND EAST OF FROGHALL ROAD
 CHEADLE

Refusal

Recommendations: This application should be refused for the following reasons:-

- 1 It is impracticable to construct an access in the position indicated on the submitted plan that would allow the requisite visibility splays to be provided within land under the applicant's control.
- 2 The submitted Transport Assessment clearly demonstrates that the additional trips generated by the proposed development will adversely affect the flow of traffic through Cheadle Town Centre but fails to propose or provide any mitigation.
- 3 The proposed development is in a less than sustainable location.
- 4 Insufficient information

REASONS

- ALL In conflict with NPPF Paragraph 110; in conflict with SMDC Local Plan Policy DC1 and T1; contrary to the interests of highway safety.
- 2 Contrary to the interests of the free flow of traffic
- 3 In conflict with SMDC Local Plan Policy T1 and T2; Contrary to the interests of pedestrian safety.

IMPORTANT INFORMATIVES TO BE INCLUDED ON DECISION NOTICE

This recommendation of refusal will not prejudice consideration of a further application at a later date when:

- safe access point commensurate with vehicle speeds and speed limits;
- proposals for mitigation of the effect of the development on surrounding network;
- proposals for adequate facilities for pedestrians;
- up to date Transport Assessment based on current free flow;
- traffic counts;
- speed surveys;

are included in the application.

NOTES TO PLANNING OFFICER

Application for a major residential development of up to 228 dwellings on the outskirts of Cheadle. It is not one of the Local Plan identified sites.

Application refers to pre application consultation. However, there has been no pre application consultation with Highways. Highways were unaware of this application until the application was submitted.

The proposed access to the site is at a point subject to national speed limit (60mph). Application unilaterally states that the existing 30mph speed limit will be relocated to the northern boundary. The applicant 'deems this appropriate' due to the 'potential' extension of the 'built up' Froghall Road frontage. It is not clear on what basis the applicant considers they are able to 'deem it appropriate'.

The masterplan shows a buffer zone between the proposed development and Froghall Road. There will be no built up frontage.

Existing dwellings to the south are set back behind a wide verge and service road. The proposed buffer zone frontage and approach to it would not encourage drivers to recognise the road as 30mph. Speed limits need to be realistic and enforceable.

Reduction of a speed limit requires a Traffic Regulation Order. This cannot be determined by the Highway Authority alone. TRO cannot be determined by the planning process. As the TRO to extend the speed limit would be essential for this access, any planning approval would be dependent on the TRO. Any Planning Permission issued on this basis could be invalid which is highly undesirable for planning authority and developer.

There was no consultation with the Highway Authority prior to this proposal. There is no evidence that any consultation has been carried out with consultees to a TRO. There is no information to suggest a TRO could or would be approved.

Visibility splay must be provided in accordance with the speed limit of the road. Such a visibility splay cannot be provided within land under the ownership of the developer, due to the horizontal and vertical alignment of the road.

Anecdotal evidence suggests speeds are greater than the 30mph limit. No speed survey has been included in the application.

A footway is proposed out of the site. However this narrows to 1.3m wide along A521 for at least 10m (developers figure). This occurs at the point where the speed limit changes from 30mph to 60mph. This narrowing adjacent to the well used A521 is not conducive to encouraging pedestrians or to highway safety. MfS considers the minimum width should be 2m (6.3.22). The existing footway on the service road narrows to as little as 0.95m. While historic, this is not conducive to encouraging pedestrians or to highway safety. Intensification of use of a footway this narrow should not be encouraged. Pedestrians are more likely to walk in the carriageway, again contrary to highway safety.

Preferred maximum comfortable walk is 800m. Site is approx 1600m from Cheadle Town Centre.

Bus services along A521 Froghall are limited.

The site is not sustainable or highly accessible by any mode other than private car.

A Transport Assessment has been submitted with the application.

Traffic Impact Analysis has been based on an old application SMD/2018/0180. The VISSIM report referred to is dated November 2017. VISSIM report referred to in current TIA is dated April 2017. VISSIM has not been rerun for this current application. No meaningful conclusions can be drawn from reference to an old report for a different scheme. VISSIM needs scheme specific flows to be input, the report run and accurate and relevant conclusions drawn.

The consultant will also recall that the November 2017 VISSIM showed a marked increase in southbound journey times between phase 1 and phase 2. It concluded a notable increase in journey time and queue length and..... caused the network to become congested. This does not appear to be referenced or extended in this current application involving the addition of 228 dwellings.

TIA asserts that the old model for SMD/2018/0180 is 'extremely robust' with little evidence.

No up to date traffic counts have been included in the application. Traffic counts for SMD/2018/0180 were taken in October 2017, four years ago. This is not current. Current counts are required for Junctions 9 calculations and to establish trip distribution.

VISSIM in SMD/2018/0180 concluded congestion and delay at Froghall Road/Leek Road junction and through Cheadle. This current development proposal concludes the effect will be minimal. This cannot reasonably be correct and is not supported by SMD/2018/0180 TA or the TA submitted with this current application. TA makes no mention of committed development. It is not clear that Ayr Road development flows are included in the figures used.

It is questionable that the TA for SMD/2018/0180 concluded congestion and delay but this TA which adds 228 dwellings concludes minimal impact.....

Even using old figures, table 7.5 shows RFC of 0.88 rising to 0.95 (PM Peak), beyond practical operational capacity. Queue length more than doubles. This cannot reasonably be described as being of minimal impact. Simple observation of the junction suggests figures are low.

Similarly Leek Road/High Street/Tape Street junction increases queue length from 85 to 106. An increase of 25% even using old and incomplete figures cannot be described as minimal impact.

The consultant will also be aware that SMD/2018/0180 recognised the severe effect its development flows would have and proposed significant mitigation. Off site junction improvements will be required under this development.

Site visited 06/10/2021

**Assistant Director - Highways and the Built County
on behalf of the County Council
as Highway Authority**