TRANSPORT TECHNICAL NOTE

Site: Mockbeggars Farm, Uckfield

Client: Obsidian Strategic Asset Management

Prepared by: DHA, Eclipse House, Eclipse Park, Sittingbourne Road, Maidstone, ME14 3EN

Date: January 2023

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Transport Technical Note has been produced to provide a response to the comments from Uckfield Town Council, which were set out in the minutes for the Plans Committee meeting held on 5th December 2022, to Planning Application Reference: WD/2022/0648/MAO. The application relates to the development of 60 residential dwellings at Mockbeggars Farm, Uckfield.

1.2 Review of Comments

1.2.1 In the minutes the following is noted with respect to the removal of on street parking:

> *"Raised concern with the removal of parking from outside the cottages at Ringles Cross and within the lay-by at Budletts common opposite Chichester Caravans as it would cause numerous issues-*
>
> *- Lay-by: Parking from the businesses may extend onto the carriage way and or pavements in other areas. It may result in the bus stop area being misused thus restricting access for buses.*
>
> *-the removal of parking outside the cottages at Ringles Cross junction would deprive residents from parking outside their own properties, where many do not have property frontages;*
>
> *-Parking could not be forced into the pub car park – the landlord had already advised of restrictions to protect their business;*
>
> *-Vehicles could not park in Snatts Road as the London Road/Snatts Road junction was already dangerous. With Parking right up to the junction, this would cause access issues for the private road just beyond the junction on Snatts Road;"*

1.2.2 The above points are acknowledged, however the removal of parking at the front of the cottages is to improve pedestrian safety, which is seen as a benefit to existing and future residents. It is also noted that existing residents of the cottages will be provided with secure off street parking in a layby arrangement which will be a short walk from their properties. It is considered that off street parking to the

north of the existing cottages should be seen as a benefit to residents, as it reduces the risk of resident cars being damaged by passing vehicles.

1.2.3 With respect to the removal of parking from the layby, this parking is likely to be associated with Spring Cottage which, as noted below, has recently had a dropped kerb permitted so that vehicles can park within the cottage curtilage. It is further noted that some of these vehicles could be associated with Chichester Caravans and Leslie Cars which have their own on site parking. It is therefore considered that the loss of parking should not be seen as a concern.

1.2.4 The following was raised with respect to the additional bus stop:

> *"Raised concerns with the proposed addition of more bus stops questioning how the proposed bus stop could affect the agreed visibility splays for the recently approved access point and dropped kerb for Spring Cottage. It was thought doubtful that any bus company would find more stops viable so close together and bearing in mind that the bus service; 729/29 services were lauded as a limited stop service. It was also questioned where the money would come from for the bus service, with subsidies for bus services being withdrawn;"*

1.2.5 The additional bus stop is a benefit to the existing and future residents. The layby arrangement would not have a negative impact on visibility for Spring Cottage, especially given that buses would only be stopped in the layby for a short time, if anything this could be seen as a betterment over long term parking.

1.2.6 The proposals include for two additional bus stops and these were requested by East Sussex Highways, as the other two bus stops were deemed to be too far from the site. Given that these stops were requested by East Sussex, it is not considered that these stops are too close together.

1.2.7 The developer will fund the implementation of these additional stops and these stops would be served by an existing bus route. It is noted that the additional use of these services by future residents will aid the funding of the routes in question.

1.2.8 The following was raised with respect to the reduction in speed:

> *"Raised concerns that the reduction to 40 MPH, 150metres beyond the proposed entrance was not far enough and felt that it should be increased up to the roundabout;* "

1.2.9 The above point was also raised by the Highways Officer and therefore the change in speed limit to a 40mph speed restriction has been extended until just south of the Budletts roundabout.

1.2.10 The following was noted with respect to overtaking on London Road:

> *"Raised concerns for the safety of road users and pedestrians in London Road where dangerous overtaking at high speed and speeding already occurred. Members would call for the introduction of no overtaking in this major road from the Ringles Cross pub to Budletts roundabout;"*

1.2.11 The above point is noted, however this was not raised as a concern within the Road Safety Audit and therefore it is not deemed a requirement to implement a solid white line to restrict overtaking. It is further noted that the reduction in speed to 40mph is likely to reduce over taking on this stretch of London Road.

1.2.12 The following point was noted with respect to correspondence with East Sussex Highways:

> *"Would like to see correspondence between Highways and DHA regarding this matter regarding safety and legality;"*

1.2.13 Please note that the relevant correspondence between East Sussex Highways and DHA should have been uploaded onto the planning portal and can therefore be viewed online.

1.2.14 The following was highlighted with respect to visibility:

> *"Raised concerns that the visibility splays relied on the boundary lines of the private property at Ringles Cross. The visibility splays for the new access point relied on what was assumed to be the boundary lines of the properties further south of the access point being kept clear. This might need to be considered when confirming calculations;"*

1.2.15 The required visibility splays can be achieved within the site boundary / highway land. This is demonstrated on the access design drawing submitted alongside the planning application and this has been accepted by East Sussex Highways. There should therefore be no concerns with respect to achieving the required visibility from the proposed access point. In terms of keeping the splays clear, it is noted that vegetation will be cut back as necessary to ensure the splays are maintained.

1.2.16 The below point was noted with respect to parked cars:

> *"Felt the parked cars at Ringles Cross provided a natural form of traffic calming;"*

1.2.17 The above point is noted, it is however considered that these parked vehicles obstruct the footway and affect the movement of pedestrians and therefore it is deemed beneficial to remove these vehicles to improve pedestrian safety. As noted above these vehicles are being moved to a layby arrangement and therefore the ability to park on this stretch of London Road will not be completely lost.

1.2.18 It is considered that the additional measures proposed including speed roundels, buff surfacing, repeater signs and the inclusion of a crossing point with refuge island will compensate for any loss in traffic calming provided by parked cars. Indeed, it is worth noting that the average speeds recorded to the north of this location were only 37mph in a northbound direction and 40mph in a southbound direction in any event.

1.2.19 The below was noted with respect to pedestrian safety:

> *"Raised concerns again for pedestrian safety as even with the hedge cut back the footpath would not be wide enough for a mobility scooter. It was believed that the hedge was on private land and the land owner might not wish to cut the hedge back as it also offered privacy;"*

1.2.20 The hedge is overhanging highway land and therefore the Highway Authority have the right to cut it back. It is also noted that the cutting back of the hedge and the widening of the footway would provide a width which is adequate to accommodate a mobility scooter. At no point will the footway in question drop below a width of 1.9m, which is considered to be acceptable with respect to the Inclusive Mobility document where the minimum footway width is 1.2m.

1.2.21 The below point was noted with respect to the Road Safety Audit (RSA):

> *"Would consider the proposal against NPPF section 9/104c.*
>
> *In section 1.3 of their report, it stated that the site was visited by the audit team on the 13th October between 10.45 and 11.25am. This was only 40 mins. According to Sustrans drawing number 20204 U SD MAP 00 01 dated 18/4/2018 London Road is on the 5/10 thousand car movements per day. Therefore 40 mins to access this point would have to be considered as pointless. It took 6m to walk from Chichester Caravans to the Ringles Cross pub and would also question at what points they visited to write this report and have time to gain sufficient data;*
>
> *Item 3.1 raised concern regarding the site being two metres higher than London Road and they would like to see the Highways response regarding their proposals, along with how this would affect the geological aspects of this site and surface water run off."*

1.2.22 Please note that the audit team would have likely completed an extensive desk top study of the site using google maps / earth, as well as other various online resources and then the site would have been visited to back up the finding of the desk top study. It is therefore considered that the completed site visit was sufficient to assess the proposals. Moreover, the audit was completed by a qualified, independent auditor who completed the assessment with respect to the UK's national standard for Road Safety Audits, GG 119 (Revision 2).

1.2.23 As per the Designers Response, the gradient at the site access will be reviewed at the detailed design stage to ensure this concern is addressed. It is also noted that surface water drainage will be considered at the detailed design stage.

1.2.24 With regard to reference to the NPPF, the proposals do not go against 104C which notes that *"opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;".* The proposals actively look to improve pedestrian and public transport facilities within the vicinity of the site.

1.3 Conclusion

1.3.1 It is considered that the above information is sufficient to address the concerns raised by Uckfield Town Council.