

Katia Clarke

Subject: FW: SMD/2022/0438 - Proposed Convenience Store, Stonehouse Farm, Ash Bank Road, Werrington

From: James Athersmith <james@exigoprojectsolutions.co.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2023 12:50 PM
To: Jeremy Hoare <jeremy.hoare@cartare.co.uk>
Cc: Katia Clarke <Katia.Clarke@planningpotential.co.uk>; Claire Temple <claire.temple@planningpotential.co.uk>; Chris Smith <chris@exigoprojectsolutions.co.uk>
Subject: FW: SMD/2022/0438 - Proposed Convenience Store, Stonehouse Farm, Ash Bank Road, Werrington

James Athersmith BA (Hons) MCIHT
Associate Transport Planner



m. 07919 990814
e. james@exigoprojectsolutions.co.uk

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: Plant, David (E,I&S) <david.plant@staffordshire.gov.uk>
Date: Friday, 5 May 2023 at 15:44
To: James Athersmith <james@exigoprojectsolutions.co.uk>
Cc: Hawe, Simon (E,I&S) <simon.hawe@staffordshire.gov.uk>, Evans, Mark (E,I&S) <mark.evans@staffordshire.gov.uk>, Johnston, Christopher <christopher.johnston@staffs Moorlands.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: SMD/2022/0438 - Proposed Convenience Store, Stonehouse Farm, Ash Bank Road, Werrington

James,

I refer to your letter of 11th Jan addressed directly to me. Has this also been submitted to SMDC as part of the planning application? It still does not appear on the website.

To respond to your points:

Submitted transport data shows that in all modelled scenario, vehicles queue back from the traffic signals across the proposed access.
I have visited the site a varying times of the day. At every visit, at every cycle of the signals, vehicles queued back at least as far as the proposed site access.

Proposed location of the store is on the opposite side of A52 to the existing store. This will locate the store on the opposite side of the A52 to the majority of the

residential properties who will likely use the convenience store. This will require customers to cross the A52.

At the current location of the store, the only residents needing to cross A52 are those south of A52. As the store is on Washerwall Lane, the reasonable route takes customers to the existing crossing of A52 at the traffic signals. Customers do not have to walk past the store then walk back on themselves on the opposite side of the A52 as would be the case with the proposed store.

Figure 1 in your letter clearly illustrates the incongruous positioning of the proposed store.

A new housing development is under construction adjacent to the proposed site. An estimated population of 172 against a catchment population of 4837 doesn't seem a good reason to relocate the store. As the existing store is on Washerwall Lane, the reasonable route for customers from this new development would take customers to the proposed crossing of A52 at the traffic signals.

The fact remains that relocating the store would encourage pedestrians to cross the A52 away from controlled crossing points which would be contrary to the interests of highway safety.

Traffic surveys were undertaken on 19th and 20th November 2021. However, this was before the 'Plan B' covid measures were introduced and at a time when Covid 19 was still a major narrative, with socialising and footfall down and employees still being encouraged to work from home. Counts are snapshot counts rather than automatic counts taken over a longer time period which would give better average and more information.

Flows, particularly peak hour, would likely be affected by the covid narrative. Given the close proximity of the proposed access to the traffic signals, representative, reliable traffic surveys are essential. I would expect snapshots to be used where the intention is to confirm what is already suspected, not to establish the acceptability of a new access this close to a traffic signal-controlled junction.

DfT AADT flows are available, but as full day counts have not been taken for this application, daily flows cannot be compared to AADT.

Manoeuvring into/out of this proposed store will affect the flow of traffic to a much greater extent than the existing store simply due to its location. A vehicle manoeuvring on a residential side road would be expected and have little effect on traffic flow. The same cannot be said of a vehicle manoeuvring or waiting on A52. This proposal will not be an improvement for the operation of the highway.

The convenience store will act as a 'top up'. Relocating it moves it away from the majority of the residential properties it will serve.

The letter refers to encouraging left in/left out movements. There is equal likelihood of right in/right out movements.

Several site visits have been carried out at different times of the day within and outside of peak hour. At each site visit, queuing was noted from the traffic lights. The shortest queue noted reached the proposed access point. The traffic signals affect

flow of traffic past this site. The centre of the access is only 35m from the stop line of the junction. It would only take 6 vehicles to queue past the access point at a cycle of the signals. From observations, this is much more common than asserted. The PICADY does not take into account the traffic signal junction. Stationary vehicles will obstruct visibility.

Queue length surveys over an extended period would have assisted.

The wheel layout and overhangs of a double decker bus are not necessarily the same as a delivery vehicle. Why would a delivery vehicle of a size used by the proposed occupier not appear in the vehicle library?

It is entirely possible that private vehicles and delivery vehicles will want to access/exit/manoeuvre in the car park at the same time. The possibility that a vehicle may have to wait on A52 while another manoeuvres/exits is entirely possible.

Have any surveys been carried out at the existing store to determine how many customers walk; how many drive and park and where they park; how long they stay in the store. Is there any data from loyalty cards for example showing where customers come from. Not every customer will have a loyalty card but it may help to guide.

These will be the same customers who would use the proposed store. Relocating the store will likely encourage more customers to drive from a time, convenience and safety point of view.

Relocating the store moves it away from the majority of the residential properties it will serve. It will be isolated by the A52 requiring more pedestrians to cross and requiring turning movements where there currently are none, close to a busy traffic signal controlled junction. This will increase the risk to pedestrian safety and will increase the likelihood of delay on the network.

The new housing development, allocated in the Local Plan and currently under construction was considered on its own merits. The housing proposal provides a safe and reasonable access away from and not affecting existing junctions. It provides safe pedestrian routes and improvements on pedestrian desire lines. The housing development is tiny in comparison to existing residential area served by the convenience store. There is no comparison between the convenience store application and the approved housing development.

Regards,



D R Plant **IEng FIHE** | Project Engineer
Sustainable Development Team - Highways and Built
County
Third Floor, Staffordshire Place 1
Tipping Street, Stafford ST16 2DH
Mobile: **01785 276702**
Email: david.plant@staffordshire.gov.uk
www.staffordshire.gov.uk