

---

Job Title

Prestwich Village

Report Type

Transport Assessment v2.1

---

Prepared for

The Prestwich Regeneration LLP

Date

17 January 2024

## Contents

|                                                         |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction .....                                   | 5  |
| 1.1 Purpose of the Report .....                         | 5  |
| 1.2 Structure of the Report.....                        | 5  |
| 1.3 Pre-Application Consultation with Bury Council..... | 5  |
| Pre-Application Engagement May 2023 .....               | 6  |
| Pre-Application Engagement July 2023 .....              | 6  |
| Parking Strategy .....                                  | 6  |
| Transport Assessment Scope.....                         | 7  |
| Adoption Strategy .....                                 | 7  |
| 1.4 Pre-Application Engagement with TfGM .....          | 7  |
| 2. Existing Site and Transport Context .....            | 9  |
| 2.1 Site Location and Existing Land Use .....           | 9  |
| 2.2 Existing Visitor Profile of Prestwich .....         | 10 |
| 2.3 Pedestrian Access .....                             | 11 |
| Access to Local Amenities .....                         | 12 |
| 2.4 Cycle Access .....                                  | 14 |
| 2.5 Public Transport .....                              | 15 |
| Accessibility Index.....                                | 16 |
| 2.6 Local Highway Network .....                         | 16 |
| 2.7 Off-street Parking Supply .....                     | 18 |
| 2.8 On-street Parking and Traffic Regulations .....     | 18 |
| Electric Vehicle Charging Points in the Vicinity .....  | 19 |
| 2.9 Car Club .....                                      | 19 |
| 2.10 Highway Safety.....                                | 19 |
| 3. Planning Policy Review .....                         | 21 |
| 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework.....             | 21 |
| 3.2 The Climate Emergency .....                         | 22 |
| 3.3 Draft Bury Local Transport Strategy 2040 .....      | 23 |
| 3.4 Emerging Bury Local Plan .....                      | 24 |
| 3.5 Parking Standards in Bury .....                     | 24 |
| 3.6 Travel Plans in Bury .....                          | 25 |
| 3.7 Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 .....    | 25 |
| 4. Development Proposals .....                          | 26 |
| 4.1 Framework Travel Plan .....                         | 26 |
| 4.2 Public Realm and Adoption Strategy .....            | 26 |
| 4.3 Changes to Public Highway .....                     | 27 |
| Rectory Lane .....                                      | 27 |
| Fairfax Road.....                                       | 27 |

|                                                                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 4.4 Cycle Parking .....                                                                         | 27 |
| Long-stay for Employees .....                                                                   | 27 |
| Short-stay for Visitors .....                                                                   | 28 |
| Plot G Travel Hub .....                                                                         | 28 |
| 4.5 Public Transport .....                                                                      | 28 |
| 4.6 Car Club .....                                                                              | 28 |
| 4.7 Car Parking .....                                                                           | 28 |
| Parking Restrictions .....                                                                      | 29 |
| Disabled Car Parking .....                                                                      | 30 |
| Electric Vehicle Charging .....                                                                 | 30 |
| 4.8 Vehicle Access .....                                                                        | 30 |
| Travel Hub Access .....                                                                         | 30 |
| Deliveries and Refuse Collection Strategy .....                                                 | 31 |
| Emergency Vehicle Access .....                                                                  | 31 |
| 5. Vehicle Trip Generation .....                                                                | 32 |
| 5.1 Vehicle Trip Generation: Proposed Development .....                                         | 32 |
| 5.2 Existing Peak Hour Trips to Longfield Car Park and Fairfax Road Car Park – Long Stayers.... | 36 |
| 5.3 Net Vehicle Trip Generation .....                                                           | 37 |
| 5.4 Transport Impact by Mode .....                                                              | 37 |
| Travel into Prestwich for Work, Shopping, or Leisure .....                                      | 37 |
| Travel away from Prestwich from the Residential Element .....                                   | 39 |
| All Trips to and from the Proposed Development .....                                            | 41 |
| 6. Vehicle Trip Distribution .....                                                              | 43 |
| 6.1 Baseline Traffic .....                                                                      | 43 |
| 6.2 Removal of Half Long Stayers .....                                                          | 43 |
| 6.3 Redistribution of Longfield Trips to Travel Hub .....                                       | 43 |
| 6.4 Future Baseline .....                                                                       | 43 |
| 6.5 Proposed Development Trips .....                                                            | 43 |
| 7. Local Highway Impact Assessment .....                                                        | 45 |
| 7.1 Data Collection .....                                                                       | 45 |
| 7.2 Background Traffic Flow in the Study Area .....                                             | 45 |
| 7.3 Identification of Network Peak Hours .....                                                  | 48 |
| 7.4 Summary of Change in Vehicle Trips in the Study Area and Junction Modelling Scope .....     | 48 |
| 7.5 Assessment Scenarios .....                                                                  | 48 |
| 7.6 Model Validation .....                                                                      | 48 |
| A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street .....                                             | 49 |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions .....                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | 50        |
| <b>7.7 Modelling Results: A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street .....</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>50</b> |
| <b>7.8 Modelling Results: Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park &amp; Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions .....</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>53</b> |
| <b>7.9 Summary of Impact on Local Highway Network.....</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>56</b> |
| <b>8. Conclusion .....</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>57</b> |
| Appendix A: Development Proposals                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |           |
| Appendix B: Meeting Minutes 10 May 2023 and 20 July 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |
| Appendix C: Bury Council Highway Development Control Pre-app Advice dated 6 July 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |           |
| Appendix D: TfGM Metrolink Pre-app Advice dated 9 June 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |           |
| Appendix E: TfGM HFAS Pre-app Advice dated 16 June 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |           |
| Appendix F: Bury Council Highway Officer approval of amended Transport Assessment Methodology                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |           |
| Appendix G: Bury Council Highway Officers Comments on Adoption Strategy and Civic Engineers' Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |           |
| Appendix H: TfGM Comments on Transport Assessment Scoping Note dated 5 October 2023, including Civic Engineers' Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |
| Appendix I: Parking Management Strategy                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |           |
| Appendix J: Place Informatics Data June 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |           |
| Appendix K: Vehicle Tracking Drawings, Adoption Strategy and Visibility Splays                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |           |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-C-10003 – Existing Extents of Adoption</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-C-10025 – Existing Extents of Adoption with Proposed Masterplan Overlaid</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40001 – Refuse Vehicle Tracking Service Yard</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40002 – Rigid Vehicle Tracking Service Yard</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40004 – Rigid Vehicle Tracking Rectory Lane</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40006 – Rigid Vehicle Tracking Rectory Lane South Entrance</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40007 – Fire Tender Vehicle Tracking Sheet 1</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40008 – Fire Tender Vehicle Tracking Sheet 1</li> <li>• 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40009 – Fire Tender Vehicle Tracking Sheet 1</li> </ul> |           |

- 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40010 – 7.5m Panel Van Tracking Service Yard
- 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-44001 – Visibility Splays

Appendix L: TRICS Output

Appendix M: Traffic Survey Data

Appendix N: *(Appendix not in use)*

Appendix O: Network Traffic Flow Figures

Appendix P: A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Road Signals information from TfGM

Appendix Q: Junction Modelling Results

## Transport Assessment v2.1

|                    |                                                      |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Prepared by</b> | <b>Kit Simmons, Michael Cameron and Emily Ingham</b> |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------|

|             |              |
|-------------|--------------|
| Reviewed by | Emily Ingham |
|-------------|--------------|

|               |      |
|---------------|------|
| Civic Job No. | 2772 |
|---------------|------|

|        |                                |
|--------|--------------------------------|
| Issued | Version 2.1 on 17 January 2024 |
|--------|--------------------------------|

|         |                                                                                                                           |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Revised | v0.1 on 16/10/2023, v0.2 13/11/2023, v1.0 27/11/2023, v1.1 6/12/2023, v1.2 11/23/2023, v1.3 on 21/12/23, v2.0 on 11/01/24 |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

This report is the copyright of Civic Engineers and is for the sole use of the person/organisation to whom it is addressed. It may not be used or referred to in whole or in part by anyone else without the express agreement of Civic Engineers. Civic Engineers do not accept liability for any loss or damage arising from any unauthorised use of this report. Civic Engineers is a trading name of Civic Engineers (Leeds) Ltd (registered number 07879122), which is a limited company registered in England, registered address Carver's Warehouse, 77 Dale Street, Manchester M1 2HG

## 1. Introduction

This Transport Assessment (TA) has been prepared by Civic Engineers on behalf of The Prestwich Regeneration LLP, a Joint Venture ('JV') between Bury Council and Muse Places, and is submitted in support of an application for hybrid planning permission at "Prestwich Village".

### 1.1 Purpose of the Report

This TA accompanies a hybrid planning application in Prestwich Village, comprising:

- The detailed component, proposing the demolition of existing buildings, and the erection of a mixed-use development comprising community, retail and commercial floorspace alongside a Travel Hub, public realm and any other associated infrastructure.
- The outline development, proposing the erection of a mixed-use development comprising residential, retail and commercial uses, public realm and any other associated infrastructure.

This TA provides a full and robust assessment of the transportation impacts of the proposals, to assist Bury Council as the Local Planning and Highway Authority, and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) as the body responsible for the operation of the Key Route Network in Greater Manchester. Details of the development proposals are provided in Section 4.

### 1.2 Structure of the Report

The structure of this report following the introduction is set out below:

- Section 1 outlines the methodology discussed with the Highways Officers at Bury Council and TfGM.
- Section 2 describes the site, its surroundings and access including existing transport links
- Section 3 provides an overview of planning policy considered relevant to the development proposals from a highways perspective.
- Section 4 provides a description of the proposed development, including parking, servicing, deliveries and emergency access
- Section 5 examines the trip rates and trip generation forecasted for the proposed development
- Section 6 shows the vehicle trips distribution on the network
- Section 7 analyses the local highway impact
- Section 8 provides a summary of the assessment and concludes the report.

### 1.3 Pre-Application Consultation with Bury Council

The scope and content of this TA has been discussed and agreed with Bury Council and TfGM in the preparation of the planning application, in accordance with the relevant guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

A number of meetings have been attended by Bury Council as the Highway Authority, including on 10 May 2023, 20 July 2023 and 30 November 2023. Minutes are attached at Appendix B. A summary of the pre-application is provided below.

### *Pre-Application Engagement May 2023*

A meeting was held between Civic Engineers and Bury Council highway officers on 10 May 2023, in which the geographic scope and specification of traffic and car parking surveys was discussed and agreed, as set out in Section 7.

### *Pre-Application Engagement July 2023*

Pre-application advice was provided by Bury Council highway officers on 6 July 2023, which is included at Appendix C. This is summarised below, along with Civic Engineers' response in *italic*:

- Potential increase in traffic on the Key Route Network and Fairfax Road needs to be considered – *see modelling results and discussion, Section 7.*
- Need to provide safe pedestrian routes from the Travel Hub – *see Section 4.3.*
- Questioned whether there are any proposals to upgrade/relocate existing controlled crossings on Fairfax Road? – *see Section 4.3, these are proposed by Bury Council as part of a separate workstream.*
- Need to retain existing levels of public parking in the Travel Hub, and comparison of existing and future demand for car parking in Prestwich should be provided – *parking demand is discussed in Section 4.7.*
- Residential parking should be provided separately to other parking, and not double counted – *a parking space for 30% of the residential units will be provided in the Travel Hub, and will not be for use by the general public. See Section 4.7.*
- Lack of parking at the development could exacerbate overspill parking on adjacent residential area both sides of Bury New Road (A56) – *the requirement for parking controls are considered within the TA, see Section 4.7.*
- Need for controls and possible charging regime for the Travel Hub – *management options are discussed in the Parking Management Strategy at Appendix I of the TA.*
- Information required about works to Rectory Lane – *see Section 4.3.*
- Request for further work on residential parking precedents – *see Parking Management Strategy at Appendix I of the TA.*
- Request for pre-submission agreement of proposed adoption plan – *see Section 4.2.*
- Clarify access and servicing arrangements – *see Section 4.8.*

### *Parking Strategy*

A meeting was held on 20 July to discuss the parking strategy, with Civic Engineers issuing a draft Outline Parking Management Strategy to provide more information. Feedback on the Outline

Parking Management Strategy was received from Bury Council highway officers on 24 August 2023 which is addressed in Section 4.7. Following a review of the assumptions on the occupation of existing retail units on site, a meeting was held on 30 November to discuss the proposal to reduce the development parking provided in the Travel Hub, as future parking demand would be significantly less than first calculated. This is discussed in more details in the Strategy at Appendix I.

### *Transport Assessment Scope*

A Transport Assessment Scoping Note was issued to Bury Council highway officers on 31 August 2023, which set out the proposed approach to the TA. Comments on the Scoping Note were subsequently received from highways officers and TfGM in October 2023 which agreed the methodology of the Transport Assessment, with some amendments made since the Scoping Note, notably that rather than using TRICS to estimate existing vehicle trips to the occupied development within the site, assumptions are made and applied to the surveyed activity at the existing car parks. Correspondence regarding the Scoping Note are included at Appendix F.

### *Adoption Strategy*

A meeting was held on between Civic Engineers and Bury Council highway officers on 18 October 2023, with comments received from highway officers on 3 November regarding the proposed access arrangements and adoption strategy. Civic Engineers responded on 9 November, with the updated strategy incorporated into Section 4 Development Proposals, of this Transport Assessment. Note that discussion around this strategy is ongoing with Bury Council highway officers.

## **1.4 Pre-Application Engagement with TfGM**

As discussed above, a number of the pre-application meetings have also been attended by TfGM colleagues including 10 May 2023 and 20 July 2023. Minutes are provided at Appendix B.

Further consultation has been carried out as follows:

**Metrolink:** On 9 June 2023 pre-application advice was provided by TfGM's Metrolink team, which was then made available to Civic Engineers. This is included at Appendix D.

**Highway Forecasting and Analytical Services (HFAS):** on 16 June 2023 pre-application advice was provided by TfGM's HFAS team. This is included at Appendix E. Comments pertaining to the requirement for and content of a Transport Assessment are incorporated in the necessary sections of this report. Other comments are listed below, with Civic Engineers' response added in *italic*:

- Consideration should be given to providing an all-red pedestrian stage at the junction of Bury New Road / Fairfax Road – *this was also discussed in the meeting on 20 July 2023 and is covered in Section 4.3.*
- Existing bus stops can be retained. High quality pedestrian routes to them should be created – *noted, see Section 4.5.*
- Scope of surveys should be agreed with Local Highways Authority (LHA) and TfGM – *see meeting minutes at Appendix B.*
- Requirement to define methodology for trip generation and distribution on the highway network – *see Sections 5-7.*

- Scope of junctions to be modelled should be agreed with LHA and TfGM – *see meeting minutes at Appendix B.*
- Drawings required showing changes to the highway network – *see Section 4.8 and Appendix K.*
- A review of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) on the surrounding streets – *see Section 2.8.*
- An assessment of the likely environmental/traffic impacts of HGVs during the construction process – *see Environmental Statement.*
- Multi-modal impact assessment required – *see Section 5.5.*
- Committed development – *see meeting minutes at Appendix B from 10 May 2023, no committed development was identified for inclusion in the Transport Assessment.*

On 5 October 2023, the development team received comments via the Bury Council on the Transport Assessment Scoping Note which had been issued by Civic Engineers on 31 August 2023. The TfGM comments and Civic Engineers' response is included at Appendix H, with TfGM stating that final agreement with Bury Council highways was required, this was achieved by email as set out in Section 1.3.

Following extensive pre-application engagement, the scope of the TA has been agreed and all points are addressed in this TA.

## 2. Existing Site and Transport Context

This section of the Transport Assessment provides a review of the existing transport context of the site.

### 2.1 Site Location and Existing Land Use

The application site as existing is 2.48 hectares and comprises a mixture of surface level car parking bound by Rectory Lane to the south and east and existing buildings including; the Longfield Centre, Prestwich Library and Prestwich Health Centre. The application site also incorporates an existing surface level car park north of Fairfax Road. The site is irregular in shape and bound by Rectory Lane to the east and south; existing retail units and Bury New Road to the west; with retail units and residential dwellings, including The Radius building to the north. In addition, the Prestwich Metrolink stop is located adjacent to the site's eastern boundary.

The site location is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Site Location

The site extends to circa 2.48 hectares (ha) and is currently occupied by existing town centre uses including a medical centre, library, the Longfield Centre (currently vacant), and two public surface car parks comprising 359 spaces.

The existing land uses surrounding the site are as follows:

- To the north of the site is Highfield Road and Highfield Place, with 2-storey residential dwellings, allotments, and a care home (Oak Lodge care home). Our Lady of Grace R C Church is also located on Fairfax Road.
- To the west of the site is the western portion of the town centre, including two pubs and a service yard accessed from Poppythorn Lane. Beyond this is the A56 Bury New Road, which is a key arterial route into Manchester to the south and M60 Junction 17 to the north. There are retail units on both sides of Bury New Road and beyond are 2-storey residential dwellings.
- To the south of the site is St Marys Church of England Primary School and Prestwich & North Western Housing Association Ltd housing estate.
- To the east of the site is the Metrolink tram line and Prestwich tram stop, which has a park and ride with 33 parking spaces. Beyond the Metrolink are 2-storey residential dwellings along Heys Road and Poppythorn Lane, and the Prestwich cricket, tennis, and bowling club.

## 2.2 Existing Visitor Profile of Prestwich

GPS data obtained and analysed by Place Informatics provides insight into current travel behaviours in Prestwich town centre. The data analysed is from June 2023. The full report is available in Appendix J with the key points summarised here:

- 67% of visitors to Prestwich town centre originate from 29 postcode areas
- 31.% of all visitors originate from the postcode areas M25 and M45 (Prestwich and Whitefield)
- 35% of all visitors originate from less than 2.5 miles of the town centre
- 27% of all visitors originate from more than 10 miles of the town centre
- 36% of all visitors use a car park when visiting the town centre, 10% use the tram, and 54.% arrive by other means
- 28% of all visits are after 1700
- Saturday has the highest after 1700 visit share and the longest average dwell time
- Grocery is the dominant reason to visit the town centre, with 80% of visitors coming to Prestwich for groceries as the main or one of the reasons for their visit.

### 2.3 Pedestrian Access

Pedestrian access to the site can be made from all sides.



*Figure 2: Signal-controlled pedestrian crossings in the vicinity of the site*

The pedestrian footway on Bury New Road adjacent to the site is circa 3.8m wide and the surface is in good condition, with streetlights and bins. Bury New Road has four signal-controlled crossings close to the site, including on the two A56 approach arms to the A56/Fairfax Road junction. These crossings have dropped kerbs and tactile paving to assist people with limited mobility or sight and people with pushchairs or wheelchairs in crossing the road and are shown on Figure 2.

The footway on Fairfax Road, which is partly located within the site, is circa 1.8m wide and the surface is in good condition. In some areas the effective width of the footway is constrained by guardrailing around crossings. There are streetlights on the north side of the road. There is a signal-controlled crossing with tactile paving and dropped kerbs between the junctions with Highfield Road and Rectory Lane. At the junction with the A56, the Fairfax Road arm does not have a green light for pedestrians, although there is a refuge, dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

The footway on Rectory Lane within the site is a minimum of circa 2m wide and the surface is in reasonably good condition. There is a raised zebra crossing (pedestrian and cyclist) linking the Metrolink stop to the town centre via the Longfield car park. It has tactile paving and guard railing.

The section of the site south of Fairfax Road currently has a pedestrianised area that connects through the site to Bury New Road, and Rectory Lane. The narrowest sections are 3m wide.

Pedestrian access to the east is via Fairfax Road and the Metrolink underpass from Heys Road, where there are modal filters so that motor vehicles are prohibited.

Figure 3 illustrates the walking isochrones from the site, noting that 2km is generally accepted as the preferred maximum walk to study or work, and 500m/1km is a distance people would walk to access daily needs, leisure uses, etc.




Figure 3: Isochrones showing 500m, 1km and 2km walking distances.

### Access to Local Amenities

The proposed development is surrounded by a range of amenities that are accessible via safe pedestrian routes, which includes footways, cycleways and crossing facilities. Figure 3 illustrates the area within a walk catchment of 500m from the site.

Table 1 below contains a list of the accessible amenities covered within the 500m walk catchment, their location and their type.

Table 1: Accessible Amenities within 500m of the Site (BREEAM guidance)

| Amenity             | Location/Distance from site boundary | Type (Based on Table 7.1 BREEAM guidance) |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Iceland Supermarket | Within site boundary                 | Appropriate food outlet                   |
| Village Greens Coop | Within site boundary                 | Appropriate food outlet                   |
| Halifax ATM         | Within site boundary                 | Access to cash                            |
| Prestwich Library   | Within site boundary                 | Community facility                        |

| Amenity                                          | Location/Distance from site boundary | Type (Based on Table 7.1 BREEAM guidance)                        |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fairfax Group Practice                           | Within site boundary                 | Public Sector GP surgery                                         |
| Ear Wax Care                                     | Within site boundary                 | Medical Centre                                                   |
| Prestwich Pharmacy                               | 0m                                   | Over the counter services associated with a pharmacy             |
| Longfield Medical Practice                       | 0m                                   | GP surgery                                                       |
| Superdrug                                        | 0m                                   | Over the counter services associated with a pharmacy             |
| InPost Parcel Locker                             | 20m                                  | Publicly available postal facility                               |
| St Mary's Church of England Aided Primary School | 30m                                  | School                                                           |
| Marks & Spencer                                  | 120m                                 | Appropriate food outlet                                          |
| Prestwich Liberal Club                           | 173m                                 | Access to an outdoor open space (public or private)              |
| Prestwich Post Office                            | 254m                                 | Publicly available postal facility                               |
| ALDI                                             | 300m                                 | Appropriate food outlet                                          |
| St Mary's Park                                   | 393m                                 | Access to an outdoor open space (public or private)              |
| Church Lane Community Centre                     | 397m                                 | Community facility                                               |
| Graveyard of Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin | 432m                                 | Access to an outdoor open space (public or private)              |
| Prestwich Cricket, Tennis and Bowling Club       | 470m                                 | Access to a recreation or leisure facility for fitness or sports |
| The Heys School                                  | 482m                                 | School                                                           |

## 2.4 Cycle Access

Cyclists can access the site from Fairfax Road, Bury New Road, and Rectory Lane. The only cycle infrastructure in the vicinity is a southbound painted cycle lane ~1m wide on A56 Bury New Road between Kingswood Road and Fairfax Road.

In the wider area, to the north and south there is a 20mph speed limit which will encourage people to cycle. An extract from the Greater Manchester cycle map is shown in Figure 4 highlighting the locations of the streets with this speed limit.



Figure 4: Extract from Greater Manchester cycle map (source: [https://tfgm.pindarcreative.co.uk/tfgm\\_interactive\\_mapping\\_county\\_map/?lat=53.48967969477546&lng=-2.2145691001787786](https://tfgm.pindarcreative.co.uk/tfgm_interactive_mapping_county_map/?lat=53.48967969477546&lng=-2.2145691001787786))

The Bee Network Map<sup>1</sup> shown below indicates that the A56 is identified as a Busy Beeway (i.e., corridors or crossing points on busier roads that will require a higher level of design intervention to improve cycling and walking). Clifton Road, Highfield Road, and Rectory Lane are identified as Beeways, see Image 1. Civic Engineers is not currently aware of any detailed schemes to provide cycle infrastructure on these routes by TfGM or Bury Council.

<sup>1</sup> [https://mappinggm.org.uk/bee-network/#os\\_maps\\_light/17/53.53270/-2.28263](https://mappinggm.org.uk/bee-network/#os_maps_light/17/53.53270/-2.28263) (accessed 15 October 2023)




Image 1: Snip from Bee Network Map

There is existing cycle parking behind Prestwich Library (5no Sheffield stands). There is also existing cycle parking close by in the Prestwich Town Centre public square and outside the Park and Ride on Metrolink's car park, shown in the images below.



Image 2: Existing Cycle Parking. Left: town centre (public square). Right: Metrolink car park.

## 2.5 Public Transport

Greater Manchester Accessibility Levels (GMAL) are a detailed and accurate measure of the accessibility of a point to both the conventional public transport network (i.e., bus, Metrolink and rail) and Greater Manchester's Local Link (flexible transport service), considering walk access time and service availability. The accessibility index score is categorised into eight levels, 1 to 8, where level 8 represents a high level of accessibility and level 1 a low level of accessibility. The site and surrounding area score a 5 on the GMAL scale, this is an average score which indicates the area is reasonably accessible by public transport and there are 5 bus stops around the site.

On the A56 Bury New Road, the bus stops serve routes 90, 94, 95, 97, 98, X41 and X43. The southbound bus stop additionally serves route 66. These bus stops each serve 11-13 buses per hour providing regular connections to Manchester city centre and other local centres. In the vicinity of the site the stops have shelters and seating. Live information boards are not provided.

There are two bus stops in Fairfax Road that serve routes 90 and 94, with 1 service each per hour. There is a bus stop on Rectory Lane (making use of the layby) next to the Park and Ride that serves route 66, which is served by 1 bus per hour. Seating and shelter are not provided at this stop.

The Green and Yellow Metrolink lines stop at Prestwich and provide connections to Bury, Manchester Piccadilly and Altrincham. It is an accessible station and has car and cycle parking provided for free. Tram services arrive every 12 minutes so there are ~ 8 trams per hour for the same destination.

### *Accessibility Index*

The Accessibility Index (AI) of the development site has been calculated for the purposes of the BREEAM assessment, and functions as an indicator for the accessibility and density of the public transport network relevant to the development site.

Information on the local public transport network, is inputted into the BREEAM Accessibility Index tool to provide a value of accessibility. For the proposed masterplan, different AI have been calculated for each building type and scores are as follows:

- PLOT A COMMUNITY HUB/GP SURGERY: AI score of 12.11
- PLOT B RETAIL: AI score of 11.97
- PLOT C MARKET HALL: AI score of 11.87
- PLOT G TRAVEL HUB: AI score of 10.99

The average AI score between the different expected uses is then of 11.76.

## **2.6 Local Highway Network**

Bury New Road is a radial route from Manchester to Bury. Adjacent to the site the carriageway is approximately 8.4m wide, consisting of one northbound and one southbound lane and one southbound painted cycle lane. There are bus laybys on both sides of the road next to the site.

At the box junction with Fairfax Road and Chester Street, Bury New Road flares to 3 lanes on each approach, and two lanes on the exits. At this junction there are pedestrian islands, dropped kerbs and tactile paving on all approaches, but no pedestrian signals (all red/green signals for pedestrians) on any of the approaches.

The DfT counted an Annual Average Daily flow of 22572 motor vehicles at count point location (Ref: 46572) on Bury New Road near the junction with Poppythorn Lane, adjacent to the site. Out of the total vehicular count, 18525 were cars or taxis, 359 buses and coaches and 3606 goods vehicles. In total, Bury New Road has experienced a reduction in daily traffic flows of around 28% since 2000.

The change in peak hour flows is shown Chart 1.




Chart 1: Change in Peak Hour Flows at DfT Count Point 46572.

Further north, Bury New Road provides a connection with the M60 Manchester Outer Ring Road at Junction 17, and to the south connections can be made with the A6044 Scholes Lane to M60 via Junction 19, as well as other key routes.

Rectory Lane, partly within the site, is a local access road to the south and east of the site with a carriageway width of around 7m which accommodates two-way traffic and gives access to the Longfield Centre Car Park and the Metrolink Park and Ride. There is a bus lay by located between the Longfield Car Park and Metrolink Park and Ride.

Fairfax Road is a local access road with a carriageway width of approximately 7m and is for two-way traffic. It cuts across the site and gives access to the east of the site beyond the tram line.

The A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street is a four-arm signalised junction. Running north to south, Bury New Road has a carriageway width of approximately 17.5m. The approach from the north and south both have 3 lanes of traffic: one for right turns, one for straight ahead only, and one for straight ahead and left turns. To the north there are 2 exit lanes, to the south there is one wide lane with merge arrows because the carriageway narrows to the south. Chester Road has a carriageway width of approximately 7m, there is one lane for the approach to the junction and one lane for the exit. Fairfax Road has a carriageway width of approximately 8m and has one approach lane and one exit lane. All arms have pedestrian crossings but there is no phase for pedestrians to cross, the crossings on Bury New Road and Fairfax Road have a pedestrian refuge in the middle of the road so that crossings can be taken in two stages.

The Fairfax Road/Highfield Road junction is a three-arm priority junction. Both roads have two-way traffic and carriageway widths of approximately 7m. Fairfax Road has the priority, vehicles exiting from Highfield Road must give way.

The Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park junction is a three-arm priority junction, with Fairfax Road having the priority movement. The entrance to the car park is approximately 5.5m wide and the carriageway on Fairfax Road approximately 7.5m wide.

The Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane junction is a three-arm priority junction where Fairfax Road has the priority. Fairfax Road has a carriageway width of approximately 7.5m and Rectory Lane a carriageway width of approximately 8m although at the bell mouth on Rectory Lane the width increases to approximately 15m.

## 2.7 Off-street Parking Supply

There are two council-controlled car parks within the site, totalling 359 parking spaces, and two smaller ones outside site within a 10-minute walk. There are also several customer-only car parks within a 10-minute walk, summarised in Table 2.

*Table 2 Car Parking within 10-minute walk*

| Name                                         | Operator                | Capacity |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Longfield Centre Car Park                    | Bury Council            | 180      |
| Fairfax Road Car Park                        | Bury Council            | 179      |
| Total on-site                                |                         | 359      |
| Clifton Road Car Park                        | Bury Council            | 17       |
| Chapel Street Car Park                       | Bury Council            | 19       |
| Prestwich Metrolink Park and Ride*           | Ocean Parking           | 33       |
| Aldi Car Park*                               | ParkingEye Limited      | 69       |
| Tesco Car Park*                              | Horizon Parking Limited | 700      |
| Total outside red line within 10-minute walk |                         | 838      |

\* *Customer only car parks.*

## 2.8 On-street Parking and Traffic Regulations

Bury New Road has double yellow lines on both sides of the road along the length of the site, the only exceptions being where there are bus stops. There is one loading zone on the west side of the road between Sherbourne Court and Clifton Road and no loading is permitted between 8am-6pm.

Rectory Lane and Fairfax Road have double yellow lines on both sides of the road along the edge of the site.

Poppythorn Lane from the A56 is pedestrianised, and that leads to a loading zone that where vehicle access, and therefore parking, is restricted, with access only for loading and access to off-street premises.

Permit parking in the area was reviewed through a desk-based assessment of streets within a 400m walk of the development (shown on Figure 7), which found there are currently no resident parking permit zones.

### Electric Vehicle Charging Points in the Vicinity

The locations of publicly accessible electric vehicle charge points in the area are shown in Figure 5. There are two charging points in the Fairfax Road Car Park, run by Be EV. There are also charging points in Tesco Car Park run by Pod Point.




Figure 5: EV Charging Locations

### 2.9 Car Club

The nearest car club vehicle is on Fairfax Road Car Park within the site, where there are two electric cars operated by Enterprise. These are expected to be re-provided within the Travel Hub or on-street. Enterprise also has a car club vehicle in Cheetham Hill, which is 4.5km away.

### 2.10 Highway Safety

An analysis of collision data using the website [www.crashmap.com](http://www.crashmap.com) has been undertaken. Data was examined for road traffic collisions in the vicinity of the site that took place in the 5-year period to 2021, the most recent year from which data is available. These are summarised in Table 3. The total number of incidents have been broken down by severity. In addition, the number of collisions involving pedestrians, cyclists or motorcyclists have been recorded.

Table 3: 5-year Crash Data

| Location      | Incident Severity |         |        | Including Vulnerable Road Users |       |            | Total Incidents |
|---------------|-------------------|---------|--------|---------------------------------|-------|------------|-----------------|
|               | Fatal             | Serious | Slight | Pedestrian                      | Cycle | Motorcycle |                 |
| Bury New Road | 0                 | 4       | 18     | 10                              | 2     | 2          | 22              |
| Rectory Lane  | 0                 | 0       | 1      | 1                               | 0     | 0          | 1               |
| Fairfax Road  | 0                 | 0       | 3      | 2                               | 0     | 0          | 3               |
| TOTAL         | 0                 | 4       | 22     | 13                              | 2     | 2          | 26              |



Figure 6: Accident Locations (Orange – Slight, Red – Serious)

Incidents appear concentrated on the junction of A56 Bury New Road /Clifton Road/Poppythorn Lane with 8 incidents, 2 of which were serious. This is a junction with no lights or crossings.

There were also 3 incidents around the junction of A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road and, while they were slight, 2 involved pedestrian casualties.

### 3. Planning Policy Review

This section of the Transport Assessment will include a review of the following local and national transport policy of relevance to the Proposed Development, along with a review of how the development will accord with policy:

#### 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF<sup>2</sup> was originally published in 2012, consolidating a number of planning documents, setting out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced. The most recent version was produced in December 2023, and places greater emphasis on beauty, place-making, the environment, sustainable development and underlines the importance of local design codes.

Chapter 9 is focused on promoting sustainable transport, and a summary of key paragraphs is provided below.

Paragraph 108 of the NPPF states that *"Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:*

- a. the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed.*
- b. opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing transport technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated.*
- c. opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued.*
- d. the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed, and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse<sup>1</sup> effects, and for net environmental gains; and*
- e. patterns of movement, streets, parking, and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places."*

Paragraph 109: development should be focused that can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering genuine choice of transport modes.

Paragraph 114 states that: *"In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

- a. appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location.*
- b. safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.*
- c. the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and*

---

<sup>2</sup> National Planning Policy Framework, December 2023.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65829e99fc07f3000d8d4529/NPPF\\_December\\_2023.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/65829e99fc07f3000d8d4529/NPPF_December_2023.pdf)  
(Accessed 11 January 2024)

- d. *any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.*
- b. *Paragraph 115 goes on to say that: "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*

*Within this context, applications for development should:*

- a. *give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use.*
- b. *address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport.*
- c. *create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards.*
- d. *allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and*
- e. *be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.*

*All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed."*

### **3.2 The Climate Emergency**

The aspiration to reduce car use and car ownership over time is a common thread running through national and local planning policies, with its links to improved local air quality, reduced impact on global climate change, increased activity levels among residents and reduction in conflict between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists.

In 2019, Bury Council declared a Climate Emergency and created a Climate Action Strategy and Action Plan to meet the target. The Climate Action Strategy defines Key Action Areas, and the Climate Action Plan describes how these areas are being addressed each year. The Council states that there has been some progress but not enough, with areas of interest including:

- 1. Our energy supply
- 2. Our homes, workplaces, and public buildings
- 3. Low carbon travel
- 4. The things we buy and throw away
- 5. Food
- 6. Our natural environment
- 7. The green economy
- 8. Environmental justice

- 9. Climate resilience and adaptation

### 3.3 Draft Bury Local Transport Strategy 2040

Bury Council adopted its new Bury Local Transport Strategy to shape investment and guide funding into the transport network throughout Bury. The strategy calls for a more inclusive transport system that supports the Council's plans for future growth. The Council has also signed up to the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 (see Section 3.7) and this document sets out how they will meet those goals. At the time of writing, as the Strategy had only recently been adopted, the version on the Bury Council website is the draft report which is summarised below.

Bury Council summarised the following issues in their Draft Bury Local Transport Strategy<sup>3</sup> which relate to Prestwich:

- The link between Prestwich Metrolink stop and the wider town centre is unattractive.
- Wayfinding and legibility around Prestwich Village to key destinations in the town is poor and in need of improvement.
- There is some cycle provision along the A56 through Prestwich Village in the form of on road advisory cycling lanes, but this is not reflected across the rest of the town.
- The M60 causes severance for pedestrians and cyclists and M60 Junction 17 is intimidating for pedestrians and cyclists.
- There is a poor sense of arrival at Prestwich tram stop.
- Prestwich Metrolink stop requires refurbishment and modernisation to improve safety, provide disabled access and a better quality of design.
- The A56 Bury New Road and the A576 Bury Old Road are very busy main roads and often experience congestion and delay, particularly if there is an incident on the motorway.

Summary of Key Transport Proposals for Prestwich:

- Improvements at Prestwich and Heaton Park Metrolink Stop
- Roll out of bus franchising with more high frequency bus routes including on the 93 & 97 (Bury to Manchester via Prestwich)
- Active travel improvements in Prestwich Town Centre including implementing School Streets where appropriate.
- Bikeability cycle training
- Street lighting column replacement & LED lamp programme 2020-2024
- Expansion of publicly available Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (EVCI)
- Preventative highway maintenance
- Highway Investment Strategy resurfacing programme
- Develop a parking strategy for Prestwich to meet resident and visitor needs.

---

<sup>3</sup> Bury Local Plan 10 Transport, Bury Council, October 2018. Available online at [Chapter 13 - Prestwich Township \(bury.gov.uk\)](#) (accessed 12 October 2023).

### 3.4 Emerging Bury Local Plan

Bury Council is currently drafting a new Local Plan which will cover all areas of the local policy to guide future development to meet sustainability targets. Topic Paper 10: Transport includes a profile of Bury and identifies the following Key Issues for Transport which relate to Prestwich:

- Traffic congestion at peak periods is largely focused on main routes in and around town centres (particularly Bury town centre) and key motorway junctions and is largely caused by extensive use of the private car.
- Road traffic is a major source of carbon emissions and is the most significant cause of poor air quality where sections of our major roads and motorways have levels of nitrogen dioxide that exceed minimum acceptable.
- The Bury line has seen significant growth in Metrolink usage and has become an important commuting asset, particularly for those travelling to work in Manchester City Centre. However, services on the Bury line are subject to over-crowding during peak periods.
- Park and Ride Facilities at Radcliffe and Whitefield are at capacity and, given the amount of Metrolink usage, the park and ride facilities at Bury Interchange and Prestwich station are considered to be inadequate.
- Ramsbottom suffers from a lack of car/coach parking provision, particularly given the attractiveness of the destination.
- To increase the use of low and ultra-low emissions vehicles.
- An opportunity to significantly improve cycling infrastructure in Bury through the Greater Manchester's (GM) Beelines project<sup>4</sup>.

### 3.5 Parking Standards in Bury

SPD 11 – Parking Standards in Bury<sup>5</sup> is written to guide the level of car and cycle parking for development proposals of particular uses. The goal is to reduce reliance on private cars and encourage use of sustainable transport modes. There are also design standards to ensure that parking facilities are inclusive and improve links between land use and transport networks.

The SPD contains a table of standards for maximum car parking provision, minimum disabled car parking provision and minimum cycle parking provision based on the development it is serving. Parking provision in a new development may be under or over the standard because of demand for parking, existing provision for parking, the capacity of the road network or potential improvements to public transport. Design considerations include:

- maintaining the character of the area,
- parking in conjunction with landscape proposals,
- security and lighting to prevent crime,
- meeting highway safety standards,
- inclusion of drop-off-zones,
- amenity of occupiers of surrounding properties.

---

<sup>4</sup> Greater Manchester's cycling and walking infrastructure proposal. Available online at <https://assets.ctfassets.net/nv7y93idf4jq/340OjdbQmsImel4AQQM8My/e8dee4819e6bc8c13036af620d81259f/Beelines.pdf> (accessed 02 November 2023).

<sup>5</sup> Development Control Policy Guidance Note 11: Parking Standards in Bury, Bury Council, May 2007. Available online at <https://www.bury.gov.uk/asset-library/parking-standards.pdf> (accessed 17 August 2023).

- sustainable urban drainage systems
- parking standards for people who are mobility impaired/disabled.
- heavy goods vehicles/ lorry parking
- short or long stay cycle parking
- parking for two-wheel motorised vehicles
- pedestrian access and permeability
- major applications/ mixed use schemes

### 3.6 Travel Plans in Bury

SPD 12 – Travel Plans in Bury<sup>6</sup> guides the use and requirements for a travel plan for new developments with the objective to reduce reliance on private vehicles, promote sustainable modes of transport and improve accessibility of developments. Types of travel plans include school, residential, umbrella, numerous developments on one site, and interim, to secure a commitment before planning applications.

Travel plans should include Background, Scope, Objectives, Measures / Actions Detailing, Targets, Action Plan, Monitoring, Evaluation.

### 3.7 Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040

Adopted in 2017 and updated in 2021, the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 has the vision 'to make Greater Manchester one of the best places in the world to grow up, get on and grow old'. It sets out how Government funding will be allocated by this devolved authority to address long-term challenges such as a rapidly growing and ageing population, climate change and the need to improve productivity and reduce social inequality in the city region.

It sets the Right Mix vision for 50% of trips to be made by sustainable modes by 2040, with no net increase in motor vehicles.

It highlights the intention to make best use of powers included in the Bus Services Act (as well as GM existing powers) to give effect to the Vision for Bus and provides an overview of plans to establish Greater Manchester as a modern, pedestrian and cycle-friendly city-region, including through the Bee Network (Manchester's cycle network) for cycling.

---

<sup>6</sup> Development Control Policy Guidance Note 12: Travel Plans in Bury, Bury Council, May 2007. Available online at <https://www.bury.gov.uk/asset-library/travel-plans-adopted.pdf> (accessed 17 August 2023).

## 4. Development Proposals

This section provides a description of the development, including access by all available modes.

The proposed development is described as follows:

*Hybrid application comprising: Full planning application proposing demolition of existing buildings and structures and the erection of a phased mixed use development including a Community Hub comprising flexible uses including library, offices medical or health services (Use Classes F1 (a-f), F2(b), E(c), E(e), E(g), a retail building (Use Classes E(a), E(b) F2(a)) and Sui Generis (hot food takeaway and bar), a new Market Hall (Use Classes E(a), E(b) and Sui Generis (hot food takeaway and bar)), a Commercial Building comprising flexible uses including retail, offices, gymnasium (Use Classes E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d), E(g), a Travel Hub comprising car parking and cycle parking (Sui Generis), a public square and public realm and associated landscaping, car parking provision, cycle storage and other associated works; and part Outline planning application (with all matters reserved) proposing a phased residential led mixed use development comprising residential (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, business, service, local community and learning uses (Use Classes E, F) and Sui Generis (hot food takeaway and bar), engineering works to Rectory Lane, new public realm, associated landscaping, car parking provision, cycle storage and other associated works.*

The proposed Masterplan is included at Appendix A.

The Development Specification which supports the application (prepared by Asteer Planning) provides more information of what is proposed at each of the six plots, which includes the GFAs used to calculate trip generation at Section 5 of this Transport Assessment.

The new plots will be supported by a network of high-quality public realm and social spaces including a new village square located centrally within the Masterplan which could be used as an event space.

### 4.1 Framework Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan accompanies this Transport Assessment, and sets out how people who work, live and visit the development will be encouraged and enabled to make sustainable travel choices, in line with the sustainability aims of the development. It supports the proposed car parking provision and the Parking Management Strategy at Appendix I.

### 4.2 Public Realm and Adoption Strategy

The existing routes through the development are adopted, and it is proposed that the new public realm will be adopted. Some areas will not be offered for adoption, in response to feedback from Bury Council highway officers (see Section 1.3, noting that this is ongoing). The existing and proposed adoption extents within Prestwich Village are shown on drawings 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-C-10003 and -10025 at Appendix K.

The new masterplan enhances the legibility of the Village centre, offering better visibility and improved connectivity in both north-south and east-west directions. These enhancements ensure safe pedestrian access to the village square and essential connections including to the proposed Travel Hub, Prestwich Metrolink stop, and the A56 Bury New Road.

## 4.3 Changes to Public Highway

### *Rectory Lane*

Upgrades will be made to Rectory Lane to reduce vehicle dominance. This will be achieved through a narrowing of the carriageway from 7.5m to 6.0m, introduction of raised tables at the north end and in line with the tram stop, retention of bus stops, introduction of new loading bays, introduction of SUDs features to create a more pleasant environment and introduction of one-way working sections where drivers have to give way to each other and thus travel at lower speeds. The proposals then will improve pedestrians' connectivity through public realm. It should be noted that the proposed improvements form part of the outline element of the application and so the exact nature of Rectory Lane improvements will be confirmed at the detailed design stage.

Proposals for Rectory Lane are shown on the plans at Appendix A.

### *Fairfax Road*

It is understood from pre-application discussions that Bury Council and TfGM intend to improve the pedestrian connectivity over Fairfax Road, as currently there is no controlled crossing over Fairfax Road at the junction with A56. An all-red phase at the A56/Fairfax Road junction has been raised during pre-application discussions, allowing all pedestrians to cross at once, and to cross each arm in one movement.

Of note, Bury Council has separate aspirations to enhance active travel which will align with the proposed Prestwich Village Masterplan. Aspirations include improved crossing points across Fairfax Road and Bury New Road. Therefore, it is considered that the development and Bury Council aspirations are aligned and the Prestwich Village proposals can incorporate Bury Council schemes for pedestrian improvements when they emerge.

## 4.4 Cycle Parking

Cycle parking is to be provided as part of the residential element of the proposed development (within D, E and F) and which will be provided in internal, secure cycle stores. As the residential plots form part of the outline element of the application (within Phase 2), the proposed quantum and specification and location of cycle parking will be confirmed at the detailed design phase. However, a range of cycle types will be provided as part of this phase and will meet or exceed the requirements of the Bury Council Parking SPD of 1 space per 5 apartments.

For the full element of the proposals (within Phase 1), cycle parking is proposed as follows:

### *Long-stay for Employees*

- Plot A: total of 24 cycle parking spaces in a dedicated store. 22 of these are on double height racks, 2 are on a Sheffield stand, providing an option for larger cycles to park. The SPD requirement of 5 staff spaces is therefore exceeded.
- Plot B: total of 6 Sheffield stands are proposed in the secure service yard, providing space for 12 cycles. The SPD requirement of 5 staff spaces is therefore exceeded.
- Plot C: no on-plot long-stay cycle parking is proposed. Staff will be able to use the provision at the Travel Hub (see below). The SPD requires 3 long-stay spaces.

### *Short-stay for Visitors*

For visitors to the development, short-stay cycle parking will be provided within the landscaping, close to entrances.

The Bury Council Parking SPD has been used for visitor cycle parking provision. 20 spaces are provided for Plots A, B, C and G (Phase 1), and 6 spaces for the retail at Plots D, E and F (Phase 2).

A total of 6 short-stay spaces for Phase 2 are provided within the public realm. This meets the requirements of the SPD for customers of the retail offer. 2 long-stay spaces will also be required for staff.

Storage will be on Sheffield stands, accommodating two cycles each, and can be seen on the plans at Appendix A.

### *Plot G Travel Hub*

The Travel Hub will provide a total of 76 new cycle parking spaces in a secure, managed facility, which will be for use by the general public/employees at Plot C.

64 of these are on double-height racks.

12 are on single-height Sheffield stands.

## **4.5 Public Transport**

As per TfGM's comments received 16 June 2023, existing bus stops will be retained with high quality pedestrian connections to them, as well as improved connections to Prestwich Metrolink tram stop across Rectory Lane, with improved crossing facilities provided.

2.5m of adopted footway will be provided behind the bus shelter on Bury New Road, see drawing - 10025 at Appendix K.

Note that on Rectory Lane, the proposed traffic calming features will include removal of the bus layby so that buses stop on carriageway.

## **4.6 Car Club**

Provision of car club vehicles is successful in removing the need for car ownership, particularly second cars. Independent research by CoMoUK, the national charity dedicated to the benefits of shared transport reported that in 2021, each car club vehicle in the UK replaced 20 private cars<sup>7</sup>.

Initially at least two cars will be provided in the Travel Hub or on street, which would be more visible to people unaware of the scheme. The accompanying Travel Plan sets out how residents will be incentivised to use car club, e.g., through free membership and/or drive time. Provision of vehicles is currently being discussed between the developer and car club operators.

## **4.7 Car Parking**

The car parking provision and management strategy is covered in detail in the Parking Management Strategy at Appendix I. In summary the proposals include:

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.como.org.uk/> (accessed 16 October 2023)

- A total of 316 parking spaces, with 275 in the new Travel Hub at Fairfax Road.
- 15 parking spaces 'on-street' on Rectory Lane, and at the Community Hub at Plot A, of which 2 will be reserved for on-call doctors if required based at the potential health facility to be located in the Community Hub, 7 are standard parking spaces and 6 are disabled parking spaces.
- 26 on-plot residential spaces, of which 14 are disabled parking spaces and 12 are standard bays.
- In total there are 63 residential parking spaces (37 in the Travel Hub and 26 on site), 14 of which are accessible.
- There are 275 spaces in the Travel Hub, of which 37 will be for residents only, therefore 238 are for the general public to use. 20 are accessible spaces.
- 28 active EV spaces are provided (10% of parking at the MSCP), of which 2 are accessible. Moreover, there will also be passive provision in place to ensure further installation if needed in the future.

Disabled and all other parking requirements set out by the Bury Council Parking SPD are met.

The Parking Management Strategy (PMS) at Appendix I sets out that the proposed parking provision detailed above can generally accommodate peak demand of the development proposals, and the retained demand arising from land uses outside of the site. The PMS also sets out the proposed management strategy for addressing peak demand.

The PMS sets out a set of measures which can and will be employed to ensure that the parking provision is appropriate, and that sustainable travel is promoted and supported.

### *Parking Restrictions*

The area indicated in Figure 7 is proposed to be considered for implementation of new or amended on-street parking restrictions, this represents a 400m (5-minute) walk from the centre of the development. This is proposed solely if on-street parking becomes an issue and will be secured via a Section 106 Agreement. The implementation of such parking restrictions, if they are required, is to ensure that users of the Proposed Development do not utilise local streets for parking but rather utilise the parking provided or utilise more sustainable modes as a method of travel. Through the S106 Agreement parking surveys will be undertaken, and if parking restrictions are required, consultation for resident-only permit zones will be undertaken and implemented as necessary.



Figure 7: Extent of Potential New On-Street Parking Control Measures

### *Disabled Car Parking*

As above, disabled car parking provision at the development exceeds Bury Council policy.

### *Electric Vehicle Charging*

As set out above, 28 of the Travel Hub parking spaces will have electric vehicle chargers, a provision of 10% of the Travel Hub, with passive provision provided for future expansion.

## **4.8 Vehicle Access**

Access proposals include limited vehicular access through the Village centre.

Vehicle access within Prestwich Village will be controlled by removable bollards. The type of bollard and operational strategy will be determined via a Development Access & Management Strategy can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

Visibility splays and vehicle swept path analysis is provided in the drawings at Appendix K.

### *Travel Hub Access*

The Travel Hub will be accessed from Fairfax Road, at the location of the existing access to the Fairfax Road surface car park.

### *Deliveries and Refuse Collection Strategy*

Deliveries and refuse collection vehicles will enter the Village centre at restricted times. As discussed with Bury Council highway officers, a continuous vehicle route will not be created through the development, instead there will be two vehicle access routes, one from Poppythorn Lane to the west and one from Rectory Lane to the east. Swept path analysis of the turning requirements are included on drawings -40001 and -40002 at Appendix K. Passing areas are proposed for when two large vehicles need to pass.

Additional tracking movements required for servicing are shown on drawings -40004, -40006 and -40010 at Appendix K.

The visibility splays of the vehicle entrances have also been checked according to the Stopping Sight Distances (SSDs) of the proposed speed limits. These are shown on drawing -44001 at Appendix K.

A loading bay will also be provided on Rectory Lane which can be used for deliveries.

### *Emergency Vehicle Access*

Emergency vehicle access will be via Bury New Road, Rectory Lane and Fairfax Road. Emergency routes have been tested with vehicle tracking, see drawings -40007 to -40009 at Appendix K.

## 5. Vehicle Trip Generation

This section sets out the methodology for trip generation of the proposed development.

Note that this is generally unchanged since the issuing of the Transport Assessment Scoping Note on 31 August 2023 to Bury Council highway officers and TfGM, except:

- Updated with the final quantum of proposed development for each land use, which has resulted in a reduction in overall trips.
- As the proposed development is similar in land use types to what is currently on site, and for which traffic and parking data was available, rather than netting off the existing trip generation and then adding on the future development, the trip generation of the net change in development for each land use has been assessed and added to the existing traffic situation, to provide a more realistic illustration of the future situation in Prestwich. This is discussed in more detail in Section 5.2, and reflects Bury Council highway officers requests during pre-application discussion to consider the existing trip generation of the site, using available survey data.

### 5.1 Vehicle Trip Generation: Proposed Development

*Purpose: to estimate the trips generated by the change in development on site in order to add these to the highway network and model the impact.*

As set out in the introduction to this Section, the trip generation of the proposed development has been taken as the difference between the development proposed and the development currently on site.

Note that, to offer a robust assessment, where a land use type is reducing (retail, community/library) no trips have been netted off, though there would be rationale to do so.

Where there has been an increase in land use floor area, the trip generation of the increase in floor area has been assessed using TRICS. This offers a realistic assessment of the trip generation of the proposed development, as much of the development is already generating trips on the highway network, which is captured in the baseline traffic surveys (see Section 7.1 and 7.2).

The change in development on site is presented in Table 4.

*Table 4: Change in Floor Area presented by Land Use*

| Land Use       | GIA (sqm/homes)    |                      |            | Change (Currently Occupied to Proposed) |      |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------|------|
|                | Existing – extant* | Existing – occupied* | Proposed** | Sqm                                     | %    |
| Retail         | 3,657              | 2,944                | 2,560      | -384                                    | -13% |
| Medical Centre | 1,313              | 1,313                | 1,914      | 601                                     | 46%  |

| Land Use                 | GIA (sqm/homes)    |                      |               | Change (Currently Occupied to Proposed) |                                |
|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                          | Existing – extant* | Existing – occupied* | Proposed**    | Sqm                                     | %                              |
| Community (inc. Library) | 1,012              | 1,012                | 475           | -537                                    | -53%                           |
| Food & Beverage          | 0                  | 0                    | 380           | 380                                     | N/A                            |
| Gym/office               | 0                  | 0                    | 955           | 955                                     | N/A                            |
| Townhouses               |                    |                      | 13 townhouses | 13 townhouses                           | N/A                            |
| Flats                    |                    |                      | 197 flats     | 197 flats                               | N/A                            |
| <b>Total GFA</b>         | <b>5,982</b>       | <b>5,269</b>         | <b>5,617</b>  | <b>-320sqm<br/>+210 homes</b>           | <b>-6% non-residential GFA</b> |

The following has therefore been assessed:

- GP – increase of 601sqm.
- Retail and Library – as these are reducing in size they are not included in the assessment. This is robust as it would have been possible to net off some trips, but this hasn't been carried out.
- Gym, Food & Beverage, Houses and Flats – the proposed GFA has been assessed, as these are new land uses on the site.

The TRICS database was used to obtain trip rates for the proposed land uses to estimate trip generation at the proposed development. Note that, as per the Development Specification, there are some units which may be one of two uses, these are:

- Within the Community Hub (Plot A), 1,914sqm of the GFA has been designed flexibly so as to accommodate an office or a community health facility (i.e. medical such as a GP). For the purpose of this assessment, this space is assumed to be a GP surgery, as this has the highest vehicle trip rate in the peak hours. Note that as 1,313sqm of GP is already existing on site and generating traffic which was captured in traffic surveys, the trip generation of the 601sqm increase in GP floor space has been assessed.
- Within Plot B, 955sqm of the GFA has been designed flexibly to accommodate either a gym or an office. For the purpose of this assessment, this space is assumed to be Gym, as this has the highest vehicle trip rate in the peak hours.

The following land use categories were used<sup>9</sup>:

- GP surgery (TRICS category 05G – GP surgeries)
- Gym (TRICS category 07K – Fitness Club (private))
- Food & beverage (TRICS categories 06B – Restaurant and 06K – Café as these are both use class E).
- Townhouses (TRICS category 03A – Private houses)
- Flats (TRICS category 03C – Private flats)

The TRICS output is at Appendix L.

Where possible, town centre locations were chosen, and the default date provided by TRICS was used (surveys since 2015). However, for some land use types there were an insufficient number of surveys, in these situations the date was extended. In some cases, there were no surveyed sites in town centres, in these situations edge of town centre was chosen as first preference, or neighbourhood centre as second preference, in these instances the default date was used unless there were insufficient surveys in which case the date was extended.

All regions were included except Greater London, in line with TfGM's usual request.

TRICS provides hourly trip rates and because the identified AM and PM weekday network peaks (see Section 7.3) were 0730-0830 and 1730-1830 respectively an average of the two hours covered by the TRICS data was used. For the Saturday peak of 1415-1515, the TRICS data from 1400-1500 was used.

For some land uses there were no Saturday surveys available, in these situations the proportion of Saturday trips compared with the PM peak hour for similar land uses was applied to the trip rates, for example, the proportion of Saturday trip rates to PM peak trips for houses was applied to the PM peak rates for flats to estimate a Saturday trip rate. This process was also used for café Saturday rates using restaurant rates.

Note that as existing, the GP is assumed to be closed on Saturdays.

It is assumed that 30% of trips for all land uses, except residential, are linked trips to other uses either within or outside the site. This is a standard approach under TRICS guidance of allowing for linked trips between different land uses in a town centre setting. **This is reflected in a 30% reduction in floor areas for each land use in Table 5, when compared to the total GFA.**

For flats and houses, it was not possible to filter sites to include only those with parking ratios of less than 30% (as proposed at the development), as no survey sites were available. For flats, no filtering took place, and the parking ratios of the sites included were 1.075, 0.649 and 0.700. For private houses the surveys were filtered to include only sites with less than 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling to exclude sites with high parking ratios, a compromise which allowed very high-car developments

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that as per the above, although there may be some office, no office has been included in the assessment, as the alternate uses at the relevant units (gym and medical) have higher trip rates in the peak hours than office and therefore have been assessed for a robust assessment. The 02/A Office TRICS output are included at Appendix L as evidence.

to be removed, whilst still having a reasonable number of sites included. As the parking ratios for the surveyed sites of both flats and houses were significantly higher than proposed, it is likely this would produce a higher trip rate, and therefore the assessment is robust.

Table 5: Proposed trip generation estimate

| Land Use                       | Trip generating GFA (sqm) / number of units (residential) | Trip rate (total vehicle trips per 100sqm) |       |       | Vehicle Trips |     |       |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|-----|-------|
|                                |                                                           | In                                         | Out   | Total | In            | Out | Total |
| Weekday AM peak hour 0730-0830 |                                                           |                                            |       |       |               |     |       |
| GP                             | 421                                                       | 1.595                                      | 0.426 | 2.021 | 7             | 2   | 9     |
|                                |                                                           |                                            |       |       |               |     |       |
| Gym                            | 669                                                       | 0.807                                      | 1.000 | 1.807 | 5             | 7   | 12    |
| Restaurant*                    | 32                                                        | 0.000                                      | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0             | 0   | 0     |
| Café*                          | 32                                                        | 0.318                                      | 0.000 | 0.318 | 0             | 0   | 0     |
| Townhouses                     | 13                                                        | 0.098                                      | 0.272 | 0.370 | 1             | 4   | 5     |
| Flats                          | 197                                                       | 0.017                                      | 0.042 | 0.059 | 3             | 8   | 12    |
| Total                          |                                                           |                                            |       |       | 17            | 20  | 37    |
| Weekday PM peak hour 1730-1830 |                                                           |                                            |       |       |               |     |       |
| GP                             | 601                                                       | 0.624                                      | 1.350 | 1.974 | 3             | 6   | 8     |
| Gym                            | 669                                                       | 2.332                                      | 1.602 | 3.934 | 16            | 11  | 26    |
| Restaurant*                    | 32                                                        | 1.894                                      | 1.039 | 2.933 | 1             | 0   | 1     |
| Café*                          | 32                                                        | 0.000                                      | 0.250 | 0.250 | 0             | 0   | 0     |
| Townhouses                     | 13                                                        | 0.234                                      | 0.131 | 0.365 | 3             | 2   | 5     |
| Flats                          | 197                                                       | 0.049                                      | 0.035 | 0.084 | 10            | 7   | 17    |
| Total                          |                                                           |                                            |       |       | 32            | 25  | 57    |
| Saturday peak hour 1415-1515   |                                                           |                                            |       |       |               |     |       |
| GP                             | 601                                                       | Closed                                     |       |       |               |     |       |
| Gym                            | 664                                                       | 0.166                                      | 0.199 | 0.365 | 1             | 1   | 2     |

| Land Use    | Trip generating GFA (sqm) / number of units (residential) | Trip rate (total vehicle trips per 100sqm) |       |       | Vehicle Trips |     |       |
|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------|-------|---------------|-----|-------|
|             |                                                           | In                                         | Out   | Total | In            | Out | Total |
| Restaurant* | 32                                                        | 0.183                                      | 1.282 | 1.465 | 0             | 0   | 0     |
| Café*       | 32                                                        | 0.000                                      | 0.308 | 0.308 | 0             | 0   | 0     |
| Townhouses  | 13                                                        | 0.184                                      | 0.160 | 0.344 | 2             | 2   | 4     |
| Flats       | 197                                                       | 0.039                                      | 0.043 | 0.081 | 8             | 8   | 16    |
| Total       |                                                           |                                            |       |       | 11            | 12  | 24    |

\*This uses the unit sizes of the Food & Beverage offer taken from the Development Specification document.  
Note that totals are subject to rounding error

## 5.2 Existing Peak Hour Trips to Longfield Car Park and Fairfax Road Car Park – Long Stayers

*Purpose: as set out in the Parking Management Strategy for Prestwich Village at Appendix I, it is expected that half of the current long stayers at the Longfield and Fairfax Road car parks will either shift to other modes of travel or choose to use other Metrolink stations in the future year scenarios when the proposed development is in place as a result of the introduction of parking tariffs for long-stay users in the Travel Hub.*

Therefore, the parking survey data from Friday 23 June 2023 and Saturday 17 June was interrogated to find out how many vehicles were arriving or departing in the peak hours that were long stayers. Duration of stay on these days was used for consistency as they are the same days from which the baseline traffic situation was derived. More details on survey data and the agreed scope with Bury Council highway officers and TfGM is provided at Section 7.1.

Half of these were then netted off, to account for future changes in behaviour.

Table 6: Half of Long Stayers arriving and departing Longfield and Fairfax Road Car Parks in the peak hours

| Peak hour  | Fairfax Road Car Park |     | Longfield Car Park |     | Total |     |
|------------|-----------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|-------|-----|
|            | In                    | Out | In                 | Out | In    | Out |
| Weekday AM | 10                    | 0   | 17                 | 5   | 27    | 5   |
| Weekday PM | 0                     | 4   | 9                  | 2   | 9     | 6   |
| Saturday   | 1                     | 0   | 2                  | 1   | 2     | 1   |

Note that totals are subject to rounding error

### 5.3 Net Vehicle Trip Generation

The net vehicle trip generation of the proposed development, with half the existing long-stayers travelling to/from the car parks in the peak hour removed is presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Net Vehicle Trip Generation

|                                   | AM Peak Hour |           |          | PM Peak Hour |           |           | Saturday Peak Hour |           |           |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|
|                                   | In           | Out       | Total    | In           | Out       | Total     | In                 | Out       | Total     |
| <b>Proposed Development Trips</b> | 17           | 20        | 37       | 32           | 25        | 57        | 11                 | 12        | 24        |
| Half long-stayers removed         | 27           | 5         | 32       | 9            | 6         | 14        | 2                  | 1         | 3         |
| <b>Net</b>                        | <b>-10</b>   | <b>15</b> | <b>5</b> | <b>23</b>    | <b>20</b> | <b>43</b> | <b>9</b>           | <b>12</b> | <b>21</b> |

*Note that totals are subject to rounding error*

As shown in Table 7, there will be an increase of 43 vehicles in the PM peak hour, which equates to approximately 1 additional vehicle every 90 seconds. There will be a smaller increase in the AM and Saturday peak hours, of just 5 and 21 extra vehicle trips, respectively.

For context, the increase in traffic on the network represents around 1.9% of the traffic currently passing through the A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road junction during the peak hours.

Section 7 provides an assessment of the impact of the development vehicle trips on the operation of the junctions on the local highway network.

### 5.4 Transport Impact by Mode

A multi-modal trip generation assessment has been carried out based on the net vehicle trip generation presented below for people travelling to and from the proposed Prestwich development. As above, this is the net increase in multi-modal trips as a result of the change in development on site.

A mode share for people traveling into Prestwich to work, shop, or for leisure, and a mode share for people living at the new development have been considered separately as travel habits of these groups will be different.

#### *Travel into Prestwich for Work, Shopping, or Leisure*

The mode share for people visiting and working at the new development is based on the GPS data Civic Engineers obtained for people travelling into Prestwich (see Section 2.2).

This data makes assumptions on how people travel based on the speed of travel and locations within Prestwich, for example data recorded at the tram stop assumes someone has arrived by tram. The mode share provided by the GPS data analysis is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: GPS mode share data

| Mode                                | Mode Share |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Tram                                | 10%        |
| Car (includes driver and passenger) | 36%        |
| Other                               | 54%        |

To further disaggregate the mode share 'Other', information from the 2011 Census (dataset WU03EW) for people travelling to work on Bury 024 was used to proportion the remaining 54% of trips to all other modes except car driver, car passenger and tram as these were already accounted for by the GPS data.

To disaggregate the GPS car driver and passenger data, the proportions from the 2011 Census were used and applied to the GPS findings.

Note that using this methodology, the resulting adjusted mode share for people travelling to Prestwich meets TfGM aspirations of 50% of journeys being by active travel or public transport.

Table 9: Mode share for travel to Prestwich for work/shopping/leisure

| Mode                                 | GPS data | 2011 Census (travel to work) | Adjusted mode share |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | 10%      | 4%                           | 10%                 |
| Train                                |          | 1%                           | 2%                  |
| Bus, minibus or coach                |          | 7%                           | 16%                 |
| Taxi                                 |          | 1%                           | 2%                  |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped         |          | 0%                           | 1%                  |
| Driving a car or van                 | 36%      | 64%                          | 32%                 |
| Passenger in a car or van            |          | 7%                           | 4%                  |
| Bicycle                              |          | 1%                           | 3%                  |
| On foot                              |          | 14%                          | 30%                 |

This mode share was then applied to the net vehicle trips for people travelling to Prestwich for work, shopping, or leisure, assumed to be the vehicle trips for all land uses except flats and houses.

The vehicle trips are assumed to be car driver trips, this provides a robust methodology because the vehicle trips also include vans and service vehicles. The total number of trips is then worked out and spread amongst the other modes as per the mode share. The multi-modal trips for people coming to Prestwich is shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Net Multi-modal trips to Prestwich

| Mode for Travel to Prestwich         | Mode share  | Total People Trips       |           |           |                          |           |            |                           |          |          |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|
|                                      |             | AM Peak Hour (0730-0830) |           |           | PM Peak Hour (1730-1830) |           |            | Sat Peak Hour (1415-1515) |          |          |
|                                      |             | In                       | Out       | Total     | In                       | Out       | Total      | In                        | Out      | Total    |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | 10%         | 4                        | 3         | 7         | 6                        | 5         | 12         | 0                         | 1        | 1        |
| Train                                | 2%          | 1                        | 1         | 2         | 1                        | 1         | 3          | 0                         | 0        | 0        |
| Bus, minibus or coach                | 16%         | 6                        | 4         | 10        | 10                       | 8         | 18         | 1                         | 1        | 2        |
| Taxi                                 | 2%          | 1                        | 1         | 1         | 1                        | 1         | 2          | 0                         | 0        | 0        |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped         | 1%          | 0                        | 0         | 0         | 0                        | 0         | 1          | 0                         | 0        | 0        |
| Driving a car or van                 | 32%         | 12                       | 8         | 21        | 19                       | 17        | 36         | 1                         | 2        | 3        |
| Passenger in a car or van            | 4%          | 1                        | 1         | 2         | 2                        | 2         | 4          | 0                         | 0        | 0        |
| Bicycle                              | 3%          | 1                        | 1         | 2         | 2                        | 1         | 3          | 0                         | 0        | 0        |
| On foot                              | 30%         | 11                       | 8         | 19        | 18                       | 16        | 33         | 1                         | 2        | 3        |
| <b>Total</b>                         | <b>100%</b> | <b>38</b>                | <b>26</b> | <b>65</b> | <b>59</b>                | <b>53</b> | <b>112</b> | <b>4</b>                  | <b>6</b> | <b>9</b> |

Note that totals are subject to rounding error

### Travel away from Prestwich from the Residential Element

The mode share for people living at the Prestwich Village development are based on 2011 Census travel to work data (dataset QS701EW for Bury 024). As drivers and non-drivers need to be disaggregated, it is assumed that an average of two people live in each home, a total of 420 people.

15% of people (63) are assumed to exhibit the same mode share as the 2011 Census, i.e. half of the people living at the 30% of homes that will have a parking space.

For the remaining 85% of residents, the Census 2011 has been amended remove the car driver mode share and increase the use of other modes proportionally.

Using the number of dwellings at the proposed development a mode share for car drivers and non-car drivers has been derived and the adjusted mode share is shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Mode share for trips from the proposed development

| Mode                                 | 2011 Census Mode Share* | Adjusted Mode Share** (no car) | Mode Share all Residents |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| No. of people                        | 63                      | 357                            | 420                      |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | 8%                      | 25%                            | 23%                      |
| Train                                | 1%                      | 4%                             | 3%                       |
| Bus, minibus or coach                | 7%                      | 22%                            | 20%                      |
| Taxi                                 | 1%                      | 3%                             | 3%                       |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped         | 1%                      | 2%                             | 2%                       |
| Driving a car or van                 | 68%                     | -                              | 10%                      |
| Passenger in a car or van            | 5%                      | 15%                            | 13%                      |
| Bicycle                              | 2%                      | 6%                             | 5%                       |
| On foot                              | 8%                      | 24%                            | 21%                      |

This mode share has been applied to the vehicle trips generated by the proposed houses and flats at the development (see Section 5.3) and multi-modal trips are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Multi-modal trips from Prestwich – proposed residential

| Mode for Travel from Prestwich       | Mode share | Total People Trips       |     |       |                          |     |       |                           |     |       |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------------|-----|-------|---------------------------|-----|-------|
|                                      |            | AM Peak Hour (0730-0830) |     |       | PM Peak Hour (1730-1830) |     |       | Sat Peak Hour (1415-1515) |     |       |
|                                      |            | In                       | Out | Total | In                       | Out | Total | In                        | Out | Total |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | 23%        | 10                       | 26  | 36    | 28                       | 19  | 47    | 22                        | 23  | 46    |
| Train                                | 3%         | 2                        | 4   | 5     | 4                        | 3   | 7     | 3                         | 4   | 7     |
| Bus, minibus or coach                | 20%        | 9                        | 23  | 32    | 25                       | 17  | 42    | 20                        | 21  | 40    |
| Taxi                                 | 3%         | 1                        | 3   | 5     | 4                        | 2   | 6     | 3                         | 3   | 6     |

| Mode for Travel from Prestwich | Mode share | Total People Trips       |     |       |                          |     |       |                           |     |       |
|--------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------------|-----|-------|---------------------------|-----|-------|
|                                |            | AM Peak Hour (0730-0830) |     |       | PM Peak Hour (1730-1830) |     |       | Sat Peak Hour (1415-1515) |     |       |
|                                |            | In                       | Out | Total | In                       | Out | Total | In                        | Out | Total |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped   | 2%         | 1                        | 2   | 3     | 2                        | 1   | 3     | 2                         | 2   | 3     |
| Driving a car or van           | 10%        | 5                        | 12  | 16    | 13                       | 9   | 21    | 10                        | 11  | 21    |
| Passenger in a car or van      | 13%        | 6                        | 15  | 21    | 17                       | 11  | 28    | 13                        | 14  | 27    |
| Bicycle                        | 5%         | 2                        | 6   | 8     | 6                        | 4   | 11    | 5                         | 5   | 10    |
| On foot                        | 21%        | 9                        | 25  | 34    | 27                       | 18  | 45    | 21                        | 22  | 43    |
| Total                          | 100%       | 45                       | 116 | 161   | 125                      | 85  | 210   | 98                        | 104 | 202   |

*Note that totals are subject to rounding error*

### *All Trips to and from the Proposed Development*

The trips to and from Prestwich shown in Table 10 and Table 12 were then added together to give an estimate of all multi-modal trips to and from the proposed development, shown in Table 13.

*Table 13: Multi-modal trips to and from the proposed development*

| Mode for Travel to and from Prestwich | Total People Trips       |     |       |                          |     |       |                           |     |       |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-------|--------------------------|-----|-------|---------------------------|-----|-------|
|                                       | AM Peak Hour (0730-0830) |     |       | PM Peak Hour (1730-1830) |     |       | Sat Peak Hour (1415-1515) |     |       |
|                                       | In                       | Out | Total | In                       | Out | Total | In                        | Out | Total |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram  | 14                       | 29  | 43    | 34                       | 25  | 59    | 23                        | 24  | 47    |
| Train                                 | 2                        | 5   | 7     | 6                        | 4   | 10    | 3                         | 4   | 7     |
| Bus, minibus or coach                 | 15                       | 27  | 42    | 34                       | 25  | 60    | 20                        | 22  | 42    |
| Taxi                                  | 2                        | 4   | 6     | 5                        | 4   | 8     | 3                         | 3   | 6     |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped          | 1                        | 2   | 3     | 2                        | 2   | 4     | 2                         | 2   | 3     |
| Driving a car or van                  | 17                       | 20  | 37    | 32                       | 25  | 57    | 11                        | 12  | 24    |

| Mode for Travel to and from Prestwich | Total People Trips       |            |            |                          |            |            |                           |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|------------|
|                                       | AM Peak Hour (0730-0830) |            |            | PM Peak Hour (1730-1830) |            |            | Sat Peak Hour (1415-1515) |            |            |
|                                       | In                       | Out        | Total      | In                       | Out        | Total      | In                        | Out        | Total      |
| Passenger in a car or van             | 7                        | 16         | 24         | 19                       | 13         | 32         | 13                        | 14         | 27         |
| Bicycle                               | 3                        | 7          | 10         | 8                        | 6          | 14         | 5                         | 5          | 10         |
| On foot                               | 21                       | 33         | 54         | 44                       | 34         | 78         | 22                        | 24         | 46         |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>164</b>               | <b>199</b> | <b>364</b> | <b>310</b>               | <b>250</b> | <b>560</b> | <b>110</b>                | <b>122</b> | <b>232</b> |

*Note that totals are subject to rounding error*

## 6. Vehicle Trip Distribution

This section sets out the methodology for distribution development trips. This is as per the Transport Assessment Scoping Note issued to Bury Council highway officers and TfGM officers on 31 August 2023. This methodology has been approved through the scoping process and pre-application discussions.

### 6.1 Baseline Traffic

Baseline traffic is distributed on the network using surveyed flows. These are described in more detail in Section 7.1, and are presented in Figures M.1-M.3 at Appendix M.

Baseline traffic survey data was used to derive the current distribution at each junction in the study area, which is presented on Figures O.1-O.3 at Appendix O.

### 6.2 Removal of Half Long Stayers

Distribution of half of long-stayers arriving/departing in the peak hours is required so that these trips can be netted off. As discussed in Section 5.1, people who currently park on a long-stay basis within the site will be discouraged from doing so when parking charges are introduced at the Travel Hub.

The 50% of existing long-stay trips to be netted off were distributed as per the existing turning proportions derived in Section 6.1.

The netted off trips are presented on Figures O.4-O.6 at Appendix O. These were then subtracted from the surveyed traffic flows, and the resulting traffic flows are shown on Figures O.7-O.9 at Appendix O.

### 6.3 Redistribution of Longfield Trips to Travel Hub

When the Longfield Car Park closes as part of the development proposals, the people currently parking there in the peak hour will instead travel to park in the Travel Hub (except for the netted off 50% of long-stayers, which are already removed from the network above).

Therefore the survey data was used to derive the retained vehicle movements to/from the Longfield Car Park, and these trips have been redistributed to the Travel Hub. This is presented on Figure O.10-O.12 at Appendix O.

### 6.4 Future Baseline

The base flows with half the long-stayers netted off have been added to the redistributed Longfield Car Park flows, to produce a future baseline. This is presented on Figures O.13-O.15 at Appendix O.

### 6.5 Proposed Development Trips

The proposed development trips were distributed to and from the proposed Travel Hub, located on the site of the existing Fairfax Road car park.

These were applied to the network using the turning proportions into and out of both of the existing on-site car parks (Longfield Car Park and Fairfax Road Car Park) as observed in the surveys at the Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane and A56/Fairfax Road junctions during the Friday 23 June 2023 and Saturday 17 June 2023 surveys, with amendments made to accommodate re-routing of vehicles

that are currently travelling north and south on Rectory Lane, who will in the future prefer the A56 as a more direct route to the Travel Hub. The future distribution is shown on Figures O.16-O.18.

Proposed Development trips are presented on Figures O.19-O.21 at Appendix O. These have been added to the future baseline trips to produce the Future Year with Proposed Development flows, as presented on Figures O.22-O.24 at Appendix O.

## 7. Local Highway Impact Assessment

This section assesses the impact of the proposed development on the local highway network at junctions where there will be more than 30 additional vehicle trips in any of the peak hours. This is the threshold for assessment dictated by TfGM and as confirmed through pre-application discussions.

### 7.1 Data Collection

Traffic counts at junctions surrounding the site were undertaken on Saturday 17 June 2023 and Friday 23 June 2023. The locations of the traffic counts were as follows:

- Longfield and Fairfax Car Park Access/Egress points
- Fairfax Road / Poppythorn Lane / Hays Road
- Fairfax Road / Highfield Road
- A56 Bury New Road / Fairfax Road / Chester Street
- A56 Bury New Road / Kingswood Road / M&S Car Park

This list of junctions and survey period was agreed with TfGM and Bury Council during the ongoing pre-app process, see minutes at Appendix B.

The survey data is provided at Appendix M and is used for modelling and validating the 2023 Base scenario and was also used for the vehicle trip distribution discussed in Section 6.



### 7.2 Background Traffic Flow in the Study Area

Background Traffic growth will not be added to the base scenarios. This was agreed with Bury Council highway officers during pre-application discussions, refer to Section 1.3. Highway officers requested that a growth scenario which considers the situation in the study area should be used, which in this situation, indicates that background growth should not be added, as evidence indicates there has been no/negative growth.

Traffic data for the peak hours within the study area have been interrogated using traffic count information from the DfT website<sup>10</sup>. The charts below show peak hour traffic counts from the DfT website for the three locations around the development. This indicates that in order to model the network, it would not be appropriate to add background traffic growth as background traffic is reducing/remaining steady in the study area.

---

<sup>10</sup> Available online at <https://roadtraffic.dft.gov.uk/#6/55.254/-6.053/basemap-regions-countpoints>






Figure 8: DfT count point data in the vicinity of Prestwich. Note that 2020 was removed as it understandably had extremely low peak hour traffic flows.

Furthermore, it would be counter-intuitive to seek to accommodate traffic growth that would undermine adopted policy aims to encourage travel by sustainable modes, e.g. in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 TfGM is aiming for 50% of trips to be by walking, cycling and public transport by 2040. In adopting the Bury Transport Strategy in October 2023, Bury Council aligns itself with the GM Strategy.

Overstating growth becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, as it drives the provision of extra road or junction capacity, which then attracts vehicle trips, a phenomenon referred to as 'induced traffic'<sup>11</sup>.

The Bury Council Climate Action Strategy 2021<sup>12</sup> sets out the importance of reducing traffic to achieve Council aims to tackle the climate emergency. Planning for traffic growth, which evidence indicates will not materialise, would contradict the aims of both the Proposed Development which is to create a sustainable development and Bury Council, and therefore, growth has not been included.

In addition to the above, no committed developments have been identified and therefore are not included, as discussed in Section 1.4 (last bullet).

<sup>11</sup> New roads create new traffic, Campaign for Better Transport [online]. Available at <https://bettertransport.org.uk/roads-nowhere/induced-traffic#:~:text=The%20report%20confirmed%20that%20major,the%20landscape%20are%20well%20known> (accessed 16/10/2023)

<sup>12</sup> Bury Council Climate Action Strategy 2021. Available at <https://www.bury.gov.uk/asset-library/climate-action-strategy-final.pdf>

### 7.3 Identification of Network Peak Hours

The turning count information at the surveyed junctions on the A56 listed above, taken on Friday 23 June 2023 and Saturday 17 June 2023, were used to define the network peak hours as:

- Weekday AM peak: 0730-0830
- Weekday PM peak: 1730-1830
- Saturday peak 1415-1515

Surveyed flows are presented on Figures O.1-O.3 at Appendix O. Full survey data is presented at Appendix M.

### 7.4 Summary of Change in Vehicle Trips in the Study Area and Junction Modelling Scope

Junctions where the net impact of the development is more than 30 two-way vehicle trips in any of the peak hours, have been modelled. The impact at of the development at the junctions in the study area are shown on the "Proposed Development Flows" diagrams at Figures O.19-O.21.

The junctions which will see an increase in more than 30 trips when compared to the existing situation are summarised below:

- Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane/Travel Hub Entrance: increase of 57 vehicle trips in the PM peak and 37 in the AM peak
- Fairfax Road/Highfield Road: increase of 38 vehicle trips in the PM peak
- A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street: increase of 32 vehicle trips in the PM peak

In the Saturday peak hour, the impact at these junctions was less than 30 additional trips and therefore modelling results for the Saturday peak hour are not presented.

### 7.5 Assessment Scenarios

The following scenarios are assessed for the identified weekday AM and PM peak hours:

- 2023 Base
- Future Year with Proposed Development

### 7.6 Model Validation

To validate the models, the queue lengths produced by the models were compared against the queue lengths recorded by independent surveys undertaken on Friday 23 June 2023 between 0700 and 0930 for the AM peak and between 1600 and 1830 for the PM peak. Survey data is provided at Appendix M.

The queue lengths from the model and the survey results have been compared using the R-Squared values (see Table 14). The R-Squared value (Coefficient of Regression) is a statistical measure in a regression model which illustrates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable which can be explained by the value of the independent variable. This allows the goodness of fit of the model results to be compared to the queues from the survey. The closer the values are to 1.0 the greater the goodness of fit. The greater difference in values for the LinSig model are anticipated to be a result of the varying signal timings over the modelled hour which result from the

use of the SCOOT system – of which single snapshot values have to be used for the model process. Table 14 shows the model represents the existing situation to a reasonable degree of confidence.

Table 14: R-Squared Values between Survey and Model Queues

| Weekday Peak | R <sup>2</sup> Value                                                     |                                                                                                                    |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|              | A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street Junction (LinSig Junction) | Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions (Junctions9) |
| AM           | 0.84                                                                     | 0.94                                                                                                               |
| PM           | 0.70                                                                     | 0.97                                                                                                               |

### A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street

The differences between the LinSig Mean Maximum Queue and the survey results can be seen in Table 15. The discrepancies between the queue lengths are anticipated to be a result of the varying signal timings resulting from the use of SCOOT, with the peaks of some of the queuing in the survey period falling outside of the peak signal phasing timed periods (0730–0830 and 1730–1830).

Table 15: A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street Queue Length Validation against 2023 Base

| Fairfax Road Right Left Ahead (2/1)    | Bury New Road South Ahead Right (3/3) | Bury New Road South Ahead Right (3/2) | Bury New Road South Ahead Left (3/1) | Chester Street Left Ahead Right (4/1) | Bury New Road North Ahead Right (1/3) | Bury New Road North Ahead Right (1/2) | Bury New Road North Left Ahead (1/1) |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Friday AM   95% Queue (Survey Results) |                                       |                                       |                                      |                                       |                                       |                                       |                                      |
| 9.25                                   | 1.25                                  | 4.75                                  | 5.25                                 | 3.75                                  | 0.25                                  | 11.25                                 | 13                                   |
| Friday AM   MMQ (LinSig)               |                                       |                                       |                                      |                                       |                                       |                                       |                                      |
| 7.8                                    | 5.3                                   |                                       | 4.8                                  | 2.6                                   | 8.5                                   |                                       | 7.0                                  |
| Friday PM   95% Queue (Survey Results) |                                       |                                       |                                      |                                       |                                       |                                       |                                      |
| 14.75                                  | 4.25                                  | 10.5                                  | 11.25                                | 5.5                                   | 1                                     | 15.75                                 | 19.5                                 |
| Friday PM   MMQ (LinSig)               |                                       |                                       |                                      |                                       |                                       |                                       |                                      |
| 11.7                                   | 8.6                                   |                                       | 7.3                                  | 3.7                                   | 11.3                                  |                                       | 9.2                                  |

### *Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions*

The Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane junctions have been validated in the same way as the LinSig junction, the results of which can be seen in Table 16.

In the calculation of the R-Squared values to compare the data sets, queue length values of zero from the survey (and their associated model queues) have been discounted as they skew the model results. Additionally, the large queue value for Highfield Road in the PM peak has been discounted as this value is considered to be unrealistic due to the model's inability to accurately reflect gap acceptance, human decision making and other factors. This is reflected in the existing keep clear zone in front of the Highfield Road which the model is unable to correctly process.

*Table 16: Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions Queue Length Validation against 2023 Base*

| S Fairfax Road East                           | T Rectory Lane | U Fairfax Road West | V Fairfax Road Car Park | Q Fairfax Road East | R Highfield Road |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| <b>Friday AM   95% Queue (Survey Results)</b> |                |                     |                         |                     |                  |
| 0                                             | 0              | 0.5                 | 0.25                    | 0                   | 1.25             |
| <b>Friday AM   95% Queue (Junctions)</b>      |                |                     |                         |                     |                  |
| 1                                             | 2              | 1                   | 1                       | 2                   | 1.3              |
| <b>Friday PM   95% Queue (Survey Results)</b> |                |                     |                         |                     |                  |
| 0                                             | 11.25          | 1                   | 1                       | 0                   | 2                |
| <b>Friday PM   95% Queue (Junctions)</b>      |                |                     |                         |                     |                  |
| 1                                             | 4              | 1                   | 1                       | 2                   | 1.9              |

## 7.7 Modelling Results: A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street

The A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street junction has been modelled using LinSig, the results of which can be seen in Table 17. Full reports from the modelling software are provided at Appendix Q.

The junction has been modelled using traffic signals data provided by Greater Manchester Urban Traffic Control, provided at Appendix P.

The junction uses a SCOOT control with green times that vary throughout the day dependent on traffic conditions on site. The traffic signal timings for each phase of the junction during the weekday AM and PM peaks have been derived from the peak values in the hour periods (0730–0830 and 1730–1830) from stage length SCOOT graphs provided by GMUTC.

The LinSig model has been assessed against the Mean Max Queue (MMQ) - measured in passenger car units (PCU), the average delay per PCU (s/PCU), the Delay (pcuHr) and the degree of saturation of the junction (%). The Delay (pcuHr) is the total aggregate delay experienced by traffic using the modelled network. The degree of saturation measures the demand relative to the total capacity. Values over 90% typically indicate traffic congestions, where vehicle queues may begin to form.

Table 17 presents the results of the modelling for each lane approaching the junction, using the existing signal timings at the junction.

Table 17: A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Street Junction Results from LinSig using Existing Timings

| Movement From<br><i>(Arm Reference in<br/>LinSig model)</i> | Weekday AM Peak<br>(0730-0830) |                                 |                | Weekday PM Peak<br>(1730-1830) |                                 |                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
|                                                             | MMQ<br>(PCU)                   | Av.<br>Delay/<br>PCU<br>(s/pcu) | Deg Sat<br>(%) | MMQ<br>(PCU)                   | Av.<br>Delay/<br>PCU<br>(s/pcu) | Deg Sat<br>(%) |
| 2023 Base                                                   |                                |                                 |                |                                |                                 |                |
| Bury New Road North<br>Left Ahead (1/1)                     | 7.8                            | 24.3                            | 55.6           | 9.2                            | 22.7                            | 49.6           |
| Bury New Road North<br>Ahead Right (1/2 + 1/3)              | 9.3                            | 24.5                            | 59.8           | 11.3                           | 23.1                            | 54.2           |
| Fairfax Road (2/1)                                          | 7.3                            | 41.7                            | 69.6           | 11.7                           | 58.8                            | 80.7           |
| Bury New Road South<br>Ahead Left (3/1)                     | 5.3                            | 21.4                            | 40.3           | 7.3                            | 20.8                            | 40.2           |
| Bury New Road South<br>Ahead Right (3/2 +<br>3/3)           | 6.2                            | 22.3                            | 45.3           | 8.6                            | 21.9                            | 44.9           |
| Chester Street Left<br>Ahead Right (4/1)                    | 2.4                            | 47.8                            | 43.4           | 3.7                            | 74.5                            | 62.0           |
| Junction PRC                                                | 29.30                          |                                 |                | 11.50                          |                                 |                |
| Delay (pcuHr)                                               | 15.20                          |                                 |                | 18.94                          |                                 |                |
| Future Year with Proposed Development                       |                                |                                 |                |                                |                                 |                |
| Bury New Road North<br>Left Ahead (1/1)                     | 7.8                            | 24.3                            | 55.6           | 9.2                            | 22.8                            | 49.9           |
| Bury New Road North<br>Ahead Right (1/2 + 1/3)              | 9.3                            | 24.5                            | 59.7           | 11.4                           | 23.1                            | 54.6           |
| Fairfax Road Right Left<br>Ahead (2/1)                      | 7.9                            | 43.6                            | 72.9           | 14.2                           | 70.6                            | 88.3           |

| Movement From<br>(Arm Reference in<br>LinSig model) | Weekday AM Peak<br>(0730-0830) |                                 |                | Weekday PM Peak<br>(1730-1830) |                                 |                |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
|                                                     | MMQ<br>(PCU)                   | Av.<br>Delay/<br>PCU<br>(s/pcu) | Deg Sat<br>(%) | MMQ<br>(PCU)                   | Av.<br>Delay/<br>PCU<br>(s/pcu) | Deg Sat<br>(%) |
| Bury New Road South<br>Ahead Left (3/1)             | 5.4                            | 21.5                            | 40.7           | 7.4                            | 20.9                            | 40.5           |
| Bury New Road South<br>Ahead Right (3/2 +<br>3/3)   | 6.2                            | 22.8                            | 46.6           | 8.7                            | 22.4                            | 46.2           |
| Chester Street Left<br>Ahead Right (4/1)            | 2.4                            | 47.8                            | 43.4           | 3.8                            | 74.9                            | 62.6           |
| Junction PRC                                        | 23.40                          |                                 |                | 15.67                          |                                 |                |
| Delay (pcuHr)                                       | 2.0                            |                                 |                | 20.94                          |                                 |                |

The modelling shows that all of the approaches operate below the industry-standard Degree of Saturation benchmark of 90% in the 2023 Base and Future Year with Proposed Development scenarios in the AM and PM peak hours.

Although the impact of the development at this junction is not considered significant, during the peak hours there will be spare capacity in the junction, which can be utilised if desired to reduce the Degree of Saturation and queuing on the Fairfax Road approach. This can be achieved by making use of the SCOOT system already available at the junction.

To illustrate this, the signal times have been optimised for the PM peak (as baseline traffic is higher in the PM than the AM, and the increase in development flows is greater in the PM than the AM) to understand how available spare capacity could be used in the Future Year with Proposed Development scenario, with the results presented in Table 18. Note that a negative value represents a decrease in queue, delay and/or Degree of Saturation.

The results demonstrate the sensitivity of the signal controls and the flow benefits that can be achieved by adjusting the signals to be 58 seconds for the first phase, 34 seconds for the second phase and 15 seconds for the third phase for the PM peak and adjusting the signals to be 43 seconds for the first phase, 25 seconds for the second phase and 14 seconds for the third phase in the AM peak.

Optimising the signals can result in a reduction in delay of 12.9 s/pcu on the Fairfax Road arm in the PM peak and a general overall increase in efficiency across the junction.

Table 18: Comparison between LinSig Optimised Signals and Existing Signals in the Future Year with Proposed Development scenario

| Movement From<br>(Arm Reference in<br>LinSig model)                     | Weekday AM Peak<br>(0730-0830) |                                 |                | Weekday PM Peak<br>(1730-1830) |                                 |                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
|                                                                         | MMQ<br>(PCU)                   | Av.<br>Delay/<br>PCU<br>(s/pcu) | Deg Sat<br>(%) | MMQ<br>(PCU)                   | Av.<br>Delay/<br>PCU<br>(s/pcu) | Deg Sat<br>(%) |
| <b>Comparison between LinSig Optimised Signals and Existing Signals</b> |                                |                                 |                |                                |                                 |                |
| Bury New Road North<br>Left Ahead (1/1)                                 | (-) 0.5                        | (-) 3.1                         | (-) 4.6        | 0.2                            | 0.8                             | 1.0            |
| Bury New Road North<br>Ahead Right (1/2 + 1/3)                          | (-) 0.7                        | (-) 3.2                         | (-) 4.8        | 0.3                            | 0.9                             | 1.1            |
| Fairfax Road (2/1)                                                      | 0.3                            | 4.1                             | 3.9            | (-) 1.5                        | (-) 12.9                        | (-) 6.3        |
| Bury New Road South<br>Ahead Left (3/1)                                 | (-) 0.3                        | (-) 2.7                         | (-) 3.4        | 0.1                            | 0.7                             | 0.8            |
| Bury New Road South<br>Ahead Right (3/2 +<br>3/3)                       | (-) 0.5                        | (-) 2.8                         | (-) 3.6        | 0.2                            | 0.8                             | 0.8            |
| Chester Street Left<br>Ahead Right (4/1)                                | 0.2                            | 9.6                             | 10.7           | 0.3                            | 10.4                            | 6.9            |

Note that a negative value represents a reduction in MMQ/Delay/Degree of Saturation as a result of optimising the signals.

In summary, for the A56 Bury Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Road junction:

- With the addition of development traffic, the Degree of Saturation remains below the industry standard 90% in all scenarios on all approaches.
- The impact on queuing is very limited when compared to the 2023 Base scenario, with a maximum increase of 2.5 vehicles on the Fairfax Road approach in the PM Future Year with Proposed Development Scenario compared to the 2023 Base.
- There is spare capacity in the junction during this time period, and the junction operation can be re-optimised using the SCOOT system already installed in order to reduce the delay and Degree of Saturation on the Fairfax Road arm.
- Therefore, the impact of the development at this junction is not considered significant.

## 7.8 Modelling Results: Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions

The three priority-controlled junctions on Fairfax Road have been modelled together in Junctionsg in order to reflect the way that the three junctions interact with each other – this includes the junctions with Highfield Road, Rectory Lane and the proposed Travel Hub. This assisted in validating the models with the real-world observations, as discussed in Section 7.6.

The Junctions9 model has been assessed against the Level of Service (see Table 19), the delay (measured in seconds) and the maximum queue length (measured in PCUs).

Typically, Junctions9 models would be compared against the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC), however, as lane simulation mode has been used to create linked junctions this is not an option. In lane simulation mode, RFC values are not calculated due to the software difficulties in defining the capacity of a whole arm which is dependent on geometries, lane configuration and turning movements.

Therefore, LOS categories have been used in place of RFC to indicate the capacity of the junction arms. LOS values in Junctions9 take into account queuing delay and delay experienced in previous time segments (Average Delay per Arriving Vehicle). They do not consider geometric delay caused by the intersection. The delay values shown are the average delay experienced by each arriving vehicle to the junction, i.e. the average amount of time each vehicle will have to wait before making their intended movement.

Table 19: Level of Service (LoS) Category Definitions

| Level of Service Typical Definitions |                           |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| A                                    | Free Flow                 |
| B                                    | Reasonable Free Flow      |
| C                                    | Stable Flow               |
| D                                    | Approaching Unstable Flow |
| E                                    | Unstable Flow             |
| F                                    | Forced or Breakdown Flow  |

The results of the modelling exercise are presented in Table 20. Full reports from the modelling software are provided at Appendix Q.

Table 20: Fairfax Road/Highfield Road, Fairfax Road/Fairfax Road Car Park & Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane Junctions results from Junctions9.

| Junction No. | Movement From     | Weekday AM Peak (0730–0830) |           |     | Weekday PM Peak (1730–1830) |           |     |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|
|              |                   | Queue (PCU)                 | Delay (s) | LOS | Queue (PCU)                 | Delay (s) | LOS |
| 2023 Base    |                   |                             |           |     |                             |           |     |
| 1            | Fairfax Road East | 0.0                         | 0.11      | A   | 0.2                         | 1.62      | A   |
|              | Rectory Lane      | 0.4                         | 9.21      | A   | 0.8                         | 20.62     | C   |
|              | Fairfax Road West | 0.2                         | 2.85      | A   | 0.2                         | 1.94      | A   |

| Junction No.                                 | Movement From         | Weekday AM Peak (0730–0830) |           |     | Weekday PM Peak (1730–1830) |           |     |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------------------------|-----------|-----|
|                                              |                       | Queue (PCU)                 | Delay (s) | LOS | Queue (PCU)                 | Delay (s) | LOS |
| 2                                            | Fairfax Road West     | 0.1                         | 0.80      | A   | 0.1                         | 0.83      | A   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road Car Park | 0.0                         | 10.20     | B   | 0.2                         | 32.31     | D   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road East     | 0.1                         | 0.61      | A   | 0.1                         | 1.25      | A   |
| 3                                            | Fairfax Road West     | 0.0                         | 0.00      | A   | 0.0                         | 0.00      | A   |
|                                              | Highfield Road        | 0.3                         | 10.32     | B   | 0.7                         | 33.53     | D   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road East     | 0.2                         | 1.75      | A   | 0.7                         | 5.73      | A   |
| <b>Future Year with Proposed Development</b> |                       |                             |           |     |                             |           |     |
| 1                                            | Fairfax Road East     | 0.0                         | 0.23      | A   | 0.2                         | 2.11      | A   |
|                                              | Rectory Lane          | 0.4                         | 10.23     | B   | 1.2                         | 24.56     | C   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road West     | 0.2                         | 2.90      | A   | 0.2                         | 2.01      | A   |
| 2                                            | Fairfax Road West     | 0.0                         | 0.44      | A   | 0.2                         | 0.55      | A   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road Car Park | 0.2                         | 9.87      | A   | 1.4                         | 53.20     | F   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road East     | 0.1                         | 0.91      | A   | 0.2                         | 2.00      | A   |
| 3                                            | Fairfax Road West     | 0.0                         | 0.00      | A   | 0.0                         | 0.00      | A   |
|                                              | Highfield Road        | 0.2                         | 9.00      | A   | 1.0                         | 61.45     | F   |
|                                              | Fairfax Road East     | 0.1                         | 2.00      | A   | 0.9                         | 7.91      | A   |

During the AM peak the LOS of the junctions is B ('Reasonably Free Flow') or above.

The PM peak shows LOS values of between C and F for the minor roads leading onto Fairfax Road (Highfield Road, Rectory Lane, and the Car Park) in all scenarios. This is likely due to the variable phase timing at the A56/Fairfax Road signalised junction as mentioned above, gap acceptance and other factors that the model cannot accurately reflect.

The software is unable to accurately model vehicles giving way to other vehicles waiting to turn right and, as such, is unable to model Keep Clear areas (noting there is one opposite Highfield Road) or other drivers in the queue to the signals letting others out. The signalised junction will meter the flow of traffic, as will the pedestrian crossing on Fairfax Road, which will provide opportunity for drivers joining from the minor arms to join Fairfax Road, and therefore the Level of Service in reality is likely to be better than modelled.

The impact of the development traffic on the modelled junctions is very limited. The maximum increase in the average queuing will be 1.2pcu on the Travel Hub approach in the PM.

Increases in delay of 27.92s on Highfield Road, 3.94s on Rectory Lane and 20.89s on the Travel Hub approach are modelled, however, as above, as the model cannot account for driver behaviour to make use of the Keep Clear marking at the end of Highfield Road, drivers letting each other out, and the metering effect of the A56/Fairfax Road signals and the signalised pedestrian crossing on Fairfax Road, the increase in delay in reality is likely to be lower.

## **7.9 Summary of Impact on Local Highway Network**

All modelled junctions operate within capacity in all scenarios. Therefore the impact of the proposed development on the highway network will not be significant.

For the signalised A56 Bury Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Junction the degree of saturation remains below the industry standard 90% in all scenarios with limited queuing impact.

For the priority linked Highfield Road/Fairfax Road, Travel Hub/Fairfax Road and Rectory Lane/Fairfax Road junctions the impact of the development traffic is considered to be limited as there are only minor increases to the average queuing values, the highest being an increase in 1.2pcu on the Travel Hub approach in the PM.

There is an increase in delay modelled on the minor roads leading onto Fairfax Road, though increase in queuing will not be significant. The length of delay presented by the model is considered to be an overstatement of what will happen in reality, as it is a result of the limitations of the modelling software, in relation to vehicles joining and giving way to an ongoing stream. The delays will be mitigated by the signal changes on the A56/Fairfax Road/Chester Road junction allowing traffic to flow from and to Fairfax Road, effectively the signalised junction will meter the flow of traffic on Fairfax Road, providing opportunities for traffic to join from the minor arms, as is currently the situation. Other drivers also make gaps for each other, which cannot be modelled, and the Keep Clear marking also provides opportunity for drivers joining from Highfield Road to join Fairfax Road.

The modelling carried out indicates that there is no significant impact on the operation of the local highway network when considering the scenarios with and without the proposed development and so no off-site highway mitigation is required.

## 8. Conclusion

This Transport Assessment has been produced to accompany the planning application for redevelopment of Prestwich Village.

It details scoping meetings and conversations held with Bury Council highway officers and TfGM officers (Section 1), carries out a policy review (Section 3) and provides a review of the local transport context (Section 2).

Section 4 provides a description of the development proposals, noting that car parking will be provided in a new Travel Hub on Fairfax Road, at the location of the existing Fairfax Road car park, and the Longfield car park will be replaced with development.

316 parking spaces are proposed, 275 in the Travel Hub and the remaining distributed across the Proposed Development. Proposed disabled parking meets Bury Council Parking SPD requirements, and 10% of the spaces will have electric vehicle chargers installed, with the remainder enabled for future provision.

Cycle parking will be provided for staff in secure areas, with provision exceeding local policy. Visitor cycle parking will be provided in line with local policy in the new public realm.

New pedestrian connections will be created within the site increasing permeability within the site and within the surrounding area, most notably with the Prestwich Metrolink tram stop. Rectory Lane will be narrowed, with wider footways, to provide a more pedestrian-friendly environment and encourage lower traffic speeds.


Pre-application engagement with Bury Council highway officers was carried out to discuss the adoption strategy.

A suite of Travel Plan measures is summarised in Section 4 and discussed in more detail in the accompanying Framework Travel Plan which will encourage and enable people at the development to make sustainable transport choices.

Sections 5-6 sets out the methodology for estimating the trip generation and trip distribution of the development traffic, which was approved by Bury Council highway officers during the pre-application scoping process. Junctions which will experience an increase in traffic of more than 30 trips have been assessed in the AM and PM peak hours.

In Section 7 the A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road/Chester Road signalised junction and the junctions on Fairfax Road (Highfield Road, Travel Hub and Rectory Lane) have been modelled using LinSig and Junctionsg respectively, with the impact of the Proposed Development traffic not having a significant impact on the operation of the junctions, with all approaches continuing to operate within capacity. No off-site highway mitigation is therefore proposed.

## Appendix A: Development Proposals



Notes:

MASTERPLAN KEY

- EXTENT OF FULL APPLICATION
- EXTENT OF OUTLINE APPLICATION

PROPOSED PLOTS

- PLOT A - COMMUNITY HUB
- PLOT B - RETAIL HUB
- PLOT C - MARKET HALL
- PLOT G - MSCP
- PLOT D - RESIDENTIAL BLOCK (ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY)
- PLOT E - RESIDENTIAL BLOCK (ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY)
- PLOT F - RESIDENTIAL BLOCK (ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES ONLY)

EXISTING KEY BUILDINGS

- THE RADIUS
- MARKS & SPENCER
- SCHOOL
- CHURCH
- PRESTWICH TRAM STOP

Project:  
Prestwich Village  
Masterplan

Drawn: LG

Rev: P00

Checked: JC

Details: 16/01/2024

Title:  
Ground floor  
Proposed site plan

Status:  
S2 Information

Planning

Drawing No:  
207-JMA-MP-00-DR-A-001400

Scale:  
1:500 @ A1

Jon Matthews Architects

Union, 2-10 Albert Square, Manchester, M2 6LW 0161 974 3690  
Copyright of this drawing is vested in Jon Matthews Architects and it must not be copied or reproduced without written consent. Figured dimensions only are to be taken from this drawing. Do not scale from this drawing. For full company disclosure please visit [www.jonmatthewsarchitects.com](http://www.jonmatthewsarchitects.com)



|                          |  |                   |  |                                                                 |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                          |  |                   |  | <b>Client</b> Prestwich Regeneration LLP                        |  |  <b>Planit I.E. Limited</b><br>Manchester   London   Liverpool   Leeds   Standish<br>E: info@planit-ie.com    W: planit-ie.com                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|                          |  |                   |  | <b>Project</b> Prestwich Village                                |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|                          |  |                   |  | <b>Drg Title</b> Landscape Masterplan<br>Phase 1 & Outline Area |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Created on</b>        |  | <b>Created by</b> |  | <b>Approved by</b>                                              |  |  THIS DRAWING IS COPYRIGHT PROTECTED AND<br>MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED IN WHOLE OR PART<br>WITHOUT WRITTEN AUTHORITY FROM THE OWNER.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 10-05-23                 |  | SAB               |  | LH                                                              |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Scale</b>             |  | <b>Size</b>       |  | <b>Workstage</b> <b>Status</b>                                  |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 1:500                    |  | A1                |  | Stage 3                                                         |  | <b>NOTES:</b><br>1. Do not scale from this drawing.<br>2. Always work to noted dimensions.<br>3. All dimensions are in millimetres unless otherwise stated.<br>4. All setting out, levels and dimensions to be agreed on site.<br>5. The dimensions of all materials must be checked on site before being laid out.<br>6. This drawing must be read with the relevant specification clauses and detail drawings.<br>7. Order of construction and setting out to be agreed on site. |
| <b>Drg No.</b>           |  |                   |  | <b>Suitability</b> <b>Revision</b>                              |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 3107-PLA-XX-XX-DR-L-0002 |  |                   |  | S4    P12                                                       |  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

© Planit I.E. Limited

## Appendix B: Meeting Minutes 10 May 2023 and 20 July 2023

## Emily Ingham

---

**From:** Keith York  
**Sent:** 21 July 2023 15:48  
**To:** Bland, David; p.stokes@bury.gov.uk; Richard Dolphin; Sally.Fletcher@tfgm.com; Stockton, Joe (Muse); Paul Morris; Crossland, Rachel; d.benjamin@bury.gov.uk; Emily Ingham; Liz McFadyean  
**Cc:** Rogers, Stuart (Muse); James Royle  
**Subject:** Prestwich Village - Highways Catch-up meeting summary

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** Filed by Newforma

All,

Thanks for attending the Prestwich Village Masterplan Highways Catch-up on Teams yesterday afternoon. Your time was appreciated, as was your general support for the proposals, and we note a few questions were raised for further exploration.

Below is a summary note of our discussion:

### *Surveys of the Baseline Parking/Traffic Situation*

We described the baseline data collection which had gone ahead as per the agreed scope of surveys/days to survey discussed previously with Bury and TfGM. This included the area of on-street parking beat surveys to aid in the future monitoring process. All attendees were content with this.

### *Car Parking Strategy*

We presented the current development proposals, outlining how the existing land uses within the red line will/can transfer into the new scheme, showing where minimal uplifts exist in elements such as the retail provision.

We then described the results of the existing parking analysis and our methodology in forecasting the future parking needs of the town, accounting for the existing use of the car park by people with a destination both within and outside of the red line boundary (and linked trips between the two). We also described the proposed residential use and its associated parking provision.

It was agreed that further measures to remove Metrolink users from the proposed Travel Hub car parking would be welcome, in order to release more spaces for the shorter-stay trips associated with the town centre's use. It was acknowledged that other nearby tram stops have facilities to accommodate park and ride more appropriately.

TfGM expressed a view that we ought to be careful not to over supply car parking, and we believe that in this location, with active and other sustainable travel options presenting a realistic alternative to car use, that a residential parking provision of 30% is appropriate. Dave would like a deeper exploration into this, and in particular referenced the implementation of a proactive Travel Plan, with measures to enable and encourage residents to make sustainable travel choices from day one.

It was agreed in principal that it would be prudent to build-in a monitoring strategy to be undertaken post occupation to inform and potential requirement for on-street parking restrictions in the local area.

Action for Civic/the JV team – we will develop a draft Parking Management Plan to indicate how such a document could become part of a planning condition which will include a more detailed description of how the effective number of parking spaces available to residents will be higher than the baseline % parking ratio quoted during our meeting, and can comfortably be accommodated within the overall 350 space provision in the Travel Hub. The draft

plan will also include a commercial view on the attractiveness of the homes from a sales and marketability perspective.

#### *Traffic Impact*

We described our methodology to forecast the “with development” traffic generation and its potential impact upon the highway network, describing how the results indicate a minor increase in overall traffic levels at the Fairfax Road/Car Park/Rectory Lane junction.

We went on to describe our junction capacity assessments at that junction, along with the traffic signal controlled junction at Fairfax Road / A56 Bury New Road. No perceptible changes are predicted in terms of the operation of these two junctions in terms of traffic conditions.

TfGM raised a query about whether additional pedestrian crossing facilities had been included in the current traffic modeling exercise. Civic confirmed that only a like-for-like test has been carried out for that junction. TfGM indicated that a package of improvements to pedestrian facilities at junctions along the A56 in this area is being developed, and they are hopeful of securing funding for those measures whilst this position is not confirmed at the moment. Civic mentioned that Bury Council has its own draft proposals for Active Travel improvements in the area, including new crossing(s) of the A56 which could complement/replace some proposals to improve crossing facilities at existing locations. It would be useful if TfGM could show how their current aspirations for pedestrian improvements at the Fairfax Rd / A56 junction can be accommodated as part of their separate study of this corridor. Civic would then take the future baseline conditions into account when comparing the proposed development impacts.

#### *Transport Technical Note 02*

Lastly, we would encourage you to provide comments on the Transport Technical Note 02 as issued a few days ago (I’m conscious that some of those who attended the call may not have been directly issued with a copy, in which case do let me know and I’ll get a copy over to you).

@Rachel – would you mind forwarding this email to those who joined that aren’t included in the to & cc boxes above please as I don’t have their details, thanks so much.

Thanks again to you all for your time and we’ll arrange a further catch-up shortly.

Best,  
Keith

**Keith York**  
Senior Associate

Mobile: 07305096603



---

Manchester / London / Leeds / Glasgow



---

*Please do not print this email unless it is necessary. Every unprinted email helps the environment.*

Civic Engineers is a trading name of Civic Engineers Limited (registered number 06824088) which is a limited company registered in England and Wales. Registered address Carver's Warehouse, 77 Dale Street, Manchester, M1 2HG. For email disclaimer, please click [here](#)

---

**From:** Keith York

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 18, 2023 5:45 PM

**To:** Bland, David <D.Bland@bury.gov.uk>; p.stokes@bury.gov.uk; Richard Dolphin <Richard.Dolphin@tfgm.com>; Sally.Fletcher@tfgm.com; Stockton, Joe (Muse) <Joe.Stockton@museplaces.com>; Paul Morris <paul@civicingineers.com>; Crossland, Rachel <R.Crossland@bury.gov.uk>; d.benjamin@bury.gov.uk

**Cc:** Rogers, Stuart (Muse) <Stuart.Rogers@museplaces.com>; Liz McFadyean <liz.mcfadyean@asteerplanning.com>; James Royle <jroyle@chromaconsulting.co.uk>; Emily Ingham <emily.ingham@civicingineers.com>

**Subject:** Prestwich Village - Traffic & Transport Technical Note 02

Good evening all,

Ahead of our Highways catch-up meeting on Thursday this week re: Prestwich Village, we would like to share with you the results of our further assessment work that we promised to undertake following our previous meeting. Accordingly, please see attached our Technical Note 02 for your review.

Due to roadworks ongoing through the month of May and into early June, and the Easter/bank holidays in April before that, the additional survey work to support this updated assessment couldn't happen until into June, hence the slightly longer time it has taken to undertake this important piece of work as our next step towards producing the formal Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to support the planning application later this year.

Hopefully you'll have some time to review the attached report ahead of our meeting and we look forward to continuing our positive conversations on the day.

If you do have any queries in the meantime, don't hesitate to get in touch.

Best,  
Keith

**Meeting Note: Prestwich Village, Initial Highways Scoping Discussion****10<sup>th</sup> May 2023****Attendees**

Peter Stokes (PS), Bury Highways

Rachel Crossland (RC), Bury Council

Paul Morris (PM), Civic Engineers

Dean Benjamin (DB), Bury Council

Keith York (KY), Civic Engineers

Alice Routledge (AR), Asteer Planning

**Discussion Note**

Following a round of introductions, PS confirmed that he had recently discussed the Prestwich Village Masterplan proposals with the client team and was therefore aware of the general proposals in terms of their scale and types of land uses.

KY described the proposed scoping process for the production of the necessary supporting traffic and highways documents which will accompany the planning application. This comprised seeking initial agreement on the geographic scope and specification of traffic and car parking surveys, followed by the submission of a series of short technical notes covering topics such as Trip Generation, Traffic Growth and a further developed car parking strategy. PS confirmed this approach was acceptable.

KY Presented Civic's proposed scope and specification for the traffic and parking surveys (as outlined in the appendix of Civic's Car Parking Technical Note 01). PS suggested that the geographic scope of the on-street parking surveys should be extended to include sections of Rectory Lane to the south of St Mary's CofE School as this area could be considered to be within walking distance of the town centre if displacement parking occurs when/if new forms of control are introduced for the off-street parking areas. PS confirmed that the extent of the additional on-street surveys should go as far south along Rectory Lane up to and including the side road called The Drive.

PS was comfortable with the proposed scope of traffic surveys and off-street parking surveys, whilst he suggested that we should give some consideration to activity in the town on a Sunday, as anecdotally this day can be the busier weekend day. KY confirmed that the scope of the parking surveys would be extended to capture a typical Sunday.

KY asked about committed developments in the area which may influence traffic and movement in and around the town centre. PS suggested discussing this also with his colleagues in the planning department whilst adding that the only scheme "in the area" which he is aware of is a proposal to reduce traffic speeds and improve active travel along the high street in Whitefield. KY suggested that any such proposals in Whitefield would be unlikely to locally impact traffic conditions in Prestwich town centre and PM added that others within Bury Council are looking at the Bury New Road corridor with TfGM and this is a separate, unrelated study to the Prestwich Village Masterplan proposals. PM said that Civic would mention the Whitefield proposals to those looking at the Bury New Road Corridor as PS said it would be good for both parties to be aware of the others' plans. PS agreed that the Whitefield Proposals were not to be considered as a committed development for the Prestwich Village Masterplan planning application.





## Booth, Claire

---

**Subject:** FW: Pre-application Enquiry No. 02850/E: Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY

**Attachments:** 207\_Prestwich\_Pre-App\_LQ.pdf; 207-JMA-MP-XX-DR-A-000000.pdf; 2772\_Prestwich Town Centre Parking and Transport Tech Note 01 Final.pdf; Comple Pre-app form 2023 - Prestwich Village.doc; Pre-Application Letter - Prestwich Village Regeneration V2.pdf; Your Prestwich - Feedback Review (reduced).pdf; RE: Pre-application Enquiry No. 02850/E: Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY/Agenda - Wednesday 21st June; FW: Prestwich Village - car parking


---

**From:** Holmes, Paul <P.Holmes@bury.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 6, 2023 11:47 AM  
**To:** Booth, Claire <Claire.Booth@bury.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Bland, David <D.Bland@bury.gov.uk>; Marno, David <D.Marno@bury.gov.uk>; Leach, Helen <H.Leach@bury.gov.uk>; Southgate, Andrew <A.M.Southgate@bury.gov.uk>; Bayfield, Chris <C.Bayfield@bury.gov.uk>; Foudy, John <J.Foudy@bury.gov.uk>; James, Karen <K.J.James@bury.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Pre-application Enquiry No. 02850/E: Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY


Hi Claire,

Further to our earlier meeting, in addition to comments already made (see attached examples), I would summarise the highway safety concerns/observations I raised at the meeting as follows:


- Impact the increase in traffic likely to be generated by the development could have on an already congested Key Route Network, as well as Fairfax Road:




- Issues associated with the above raised separately by TfGM addressed/responded to, including, but not limited to:



- Remote parking being adopted as a key part of the development and need to ensure that safe routes, especially for pedestrians, the disabled, partially sighted, etc., would be provided as part of the development. What proposals are there to upgrade and/or relocate the existing controlled crossing?



- Need to retain (as a minimum) the existing levels of public car parking within the proposed multi-storey car/Mobility Hub.
- Comparison between the demands of the existing site and the new development, including a review of the theoretical parking provision that should be provided for both, albeit a real-world view would be taken as the existing provision on the two sites is not just provided for the Longfield, but for Prestwich as a whole.
- Whilst I would reiterate that remote parking is not ideal, especially for a residential development, the allocated parking provision for the vast majority of the future residents on the site needs to be clarified and not be double counted within the overall parking provision. Any lack of parking could well exacerbate the problem of overspill parking within the adjacent residential areas on both side of the A56 Bury New Road.
- Proposed controls on the future car parking facilities and potential charging regime as these issues alone could well require a Residents Parking Scheme to be required (the extents of which are unknown).
- What proposals are there to downgrade Rectory Lane? Is this predominantly to increase footway widths around the perimeter of the development without impacting on current carriageway widths? Rectory Lane provides a well-used link for access to and from the town centre, Metrolink, etc. by local residents, as well as serving such uses as St. Mary's C of E Primary School, etc.
- The email received today also seems to be factually incorrect:



## FW: Prestwich Village - car parking



Booth, Claire

To: Marno, David; Bland, David; Holmes, Paul

Start your reply all with:

[Thank you!](#)

[Thanks for sharing!](#)

[Thanks for keeping me in the loop.](#)

[Feedback](#)

The proposed new homes within the Prestwich Village development are in a highly sustainable location, being accessible by high-frequency public alternative to the use of the private car. Commuters can access the city centre in just 30 minutes by tram, utilising the Metrolink Tramstop on the developing proposals to enhance active travel in the area, including new/improved cycle routes and new crossings on the A56 to increase east-west

Below is a list of examples of similar urban schemes which provide a similar or lower level of parking:

### Low-Car Development Precedent Examples

- Radius Development, Prestwich, comprises 145 homes along with 50 parking spaces within the council's adjacent car park (this equates to a ratio of just under 35%).
- Leeds City Village is a 1,000-apartment scheme which received planning permission in 2022, with 155 parking spaces proposed, a ratio of see a reduction in parking to 95 spaces, or 9.5%.
- Ordnance Lane is a new residential development on the outskirts of York city centre which is being delivered as part of the York Housing D 2021-2022. The scheme includes new terraces of homes connected by communal gardens and vehicle-free alleyways, with parking provisions for 10% and 20% of the total floor space.
- Large-scale residential development at Angel Meadow in Manchester and Globe Road in Leeds have parking provisions for 10% and 20% of the total floor space.
- Collyhurst Village in Manchester, two apartment buildings providing 26% and 42% car parking.

I have asked the team for the existing floor space figures you asked for and will forward on as soon as I have those.



relates to several **city centre** schemes (which cannot really be compared to 'Prestwich Village') and needs to be revisited if it is to be used as justification for the low level of parking provision being proposed.

- Need to clarify the physical impact the development will have on the existing adopted highway as part of the development, based on a topographical survey of the site and adjacent adopted highways – the extents of any stopping-up orders required to facilitate the development and all areas of new adopted highway will need to be agreed at an early stage, pre-submission of the planning application (as we have done with the Bury Flexihall and Radcliffe Hub schemes).
- Need to clarify all access arrangements onto the adopted highway as part of the future planning application based on a topographical survey of the site and adjacent adopted highways.
- Servicing arrangements for all buildings clarified/detailed, and appropriate turning facilities and/or on-highway loading facilities agreed/provided.
- The views of my colleagues in Highways – Transportation/Car Parking/Traffic Management/Major Projects, etc. will be required going forward.

Hope that this assists but please let me know if you require anything further.

Regards,

**Paul Holmes**

**Principal Engineer (Development)**

Engineering Consultancy

0161 253 5788

**Bury Council**

**Department of Operations**

**Engineering Services**

3 Knowsley Place  
Duke Street  
BURY  
BL9 0EJ

[p.holmes@bury.gov.uk](mailto:p.holmes@bury.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Simpson, Joss

**Sent:** 22 May 2023 11:04

**To:** [landuse@tfgm.com](mailto:landuse@tfgm.com); SPPlanning.RFH <[SPPlanning.RFH@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:SPPlanning.RFH@environment-agency.gov.uk)>; [lupenquiries@hse.gov.uk](mailto:lupenquiries@hse.gov.uk); [planningliaison@uuplc.co.uk](mailto:planningliaison@uuplc.co.uk); [buildingregs@manchesterfire.gov.uk](mailto:buildingregs@manchesterfire.gov.uk); [gmaas@salford.ac.uk](mailto:gmaas@salford.ac.uk); [info@designforsecurity.org](mailto:info@designforsecurity.org); Planning Policy <[Planning.Policy@bury.gov.uk](mailto:Planning.Policy@bury.gov.uk)>; hdc <[Highwaysdc@bury.gov.uk](mailto:Highwaysdc@bury.gov.uk)>; Kilby, Mark D. <[M.D.Kilby@bury.gov.uk](mailto:M.D.Kilby@bury.gov.uk)>; envsection <[envsection@bury.gov.uk](mailto:envsection@bury.gov.uk)>; Neighbourhoods Enforcement <[Neighbourhoods.Enfor@bury.gov.uk](mailto:Neighbourhoods.Enfor@bury.gov.uk)>; Beardwood, Leslie <[L.Beardwood@bury.gov.uk](mailto:L.Beardwood@bury.gov.uk)>; drainageconsultation <[drainageconsultation@bury.gov.uk](mailto:drainageconsultation@bury.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Booth, Claire <[Claire.Booth@bury.gov.uk](mailto:Claire.Booth@bury.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Pre-Application Advice consultation (ref no. 02850/E) - Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY

Good morning,

Please see attached details of a pre-application enquiry (ref no. 02850/E) you may wish to comment on. Please submit any comments to the Case Officer Claire Booth, email - [Claire.booth@bury.gov.uk](mailto:Claire.booth@bury.gov.uk) no later than 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023.

Kind regards,

**Joss Simpson**

Technical Support - Development Control

Bury Council

Email: [Joss.Simpson@bury.gov.uk](mailto:Joss.Simpson@bury.gov.uk)

Website: [Planning, building control and development - Bury Council](#)

Tel: 0161 253 5321

Under the General Data Protection Regulation as supplemented by the UK Data Protection Act 2018, by providing your personal information you are giving your consent for us to use and collate your personal data to enable us to perform the contract we have entered into with you to process your planning application, enquiry or representation and comply with our legal obligation to carry out a public task/function and provide a planning service.

To find out how we process your personal information please read our Privacy Notice at <https://www.bury.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=14263>



## Booth, Claire

---

**From:** Lynda Griffin <Lynda.Griffin@tfgm.com>  
**Sent:** 09 June 2023 12:52  
**To:** Booth, Claire  
**Cc:** Sophie Rothwell; Alan Lowe; Andrew Charnock; Darren Embury; eplanner@metrolink.co.uk; Landuse; Projects@metrolink.co.uk; Rapid Transit Development  
**Subject:** RE: Pre-Application Advice consultation (ref no. 02850/E) - Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Claire,

**Planning Ref:** 02850/E  
**Proposal:** Prestwich Village Centre Regeneration  
**Location:** Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY

I refer to the abovementioned Pre- Application enquiry and comment as follows from a Metrolink perspective:

Whilst the proposed regeneration area does not have a physical interface with Metrolink infrastructure we note that there will be more reliance on public transport to support the regeneration and also that a number of comments in the feedback were around safety and security.

Metrolink are aware that the Metrolink Stop, particularly the underpass and staircase areas, are not particularly inviting and would benefit from some enhancements. With the above points in mind we consider that the regeneration works should aim to deliver these improvements with better lighting, renewed décor, new windows and pigeon netting as a minimum contribution.

It is also considered that there may be an opportunity for some community inspired artwork to be provided, similar to that included at Cornbrook underpass or on the Chorlton lift buildings, this could focus on the heritage of the area, to address other feedback.

Should a full Application come forward for the Prestwich Village Centre regeneration Metrolink would seek to secure s106 monies or an Agreement for the scheme to deliver appropriate enhancements to the Metrolink Stop.

Regards

Lynda

Lynda Griffin

Approvals and Consents Manager  
Metrolink  
Transport for Greater Manchester

2 Piccadilly Place, Manchester M1 3BG

Mobile 07901220488  
Office fax 0161 244 1316

Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to!

**TfGM supports working flexibly. If I contact you outside your usual working hours then please reply when it's convenient for you.**

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by individuals or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please notify the sender immediately and delete the email and any attachments. As a public body, Transport for Greater Manchester may be required to disclose this email or any response to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, unless the information in it is covered by one of the exemptions in the Act. This email has been scanned by anti-malware and anti-spam controls using Defender for Office 365.



Bury Council  
Planning Services  
3 Knowsley Place  
Duke Street  
Bury  
BL9 0EJ

*Our ref* TRA/23/196

*Your ref:*

16<sup>th</sup> June 2023

Dear Sir / Madam

Reference Number: **02850/E**

Location: **Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich, Manchester, M25 1AY**

Proposal: **A hybrid planning application to demolish the Longfield Centre and propose the following development:**

- 1. Retail – circa 4,200 sqm**
- 2. Commercial / Medical space – circa 3,000 sqm**
- 3. Community – circa 1,300 sqm**
- 4. Residential – circa 235 units**
- 5. MSCP – circa 12,000 sqm / 350 spaces**

Thank you for consulting Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) on the above pre-planning application. The following comments are offered as advice on transport issues for you to balance against other factors and are made in the context of TfGM's role in the planning process, as set out in the footnote below.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>TfGM does not have any planning powers and is not a statutory consultee in the planning process. The purpose of the advice offered is to suggest the best way to improve land use / transport integration through the development proposals. Advice is based on the information provided by the applicant, and it is not TfGM's role to undertake detailed verification unless specifically commissioned to do so. <sup>2</sup>TfGM control and manage the traffic signals in Greater Manchester, as such any schemes that alter signalised junctions need to be agreed with TfGM. Additionally, where developments impact on signalised junctions, TfGM have a duty of care to ensure that these impacts are satisfactorily mitigated as part of the planning process.

## Background

TfGM scoping advice has been requested by Bury Council in respect of the proposed redevelopment of Prestwich Village Centre, to deliver new community, retail, commercial, residential and car parking use.

TfGM would suggest that eventually a full Transport Assessment (TA) should be provided as part of the application. The TA should contain the information specified within the following sections of this letter.

### I. Site Specific Comments

- I. It is noted that colleagues within TfGM Highways and Strategic Development teams are in discussions regarding the proposed development and are developing the specific details in collaboration with the applicant and the Local Authority.
- II. A trip generation and distribution exercise should be undertaken as soon as possible to inform the assessment work and junctions to be assessed.
- III. Consideration should be given to providing an all-red pedestrian stage at the junction of Bury New Road / Fairfax Road.
- IV. Colleagues within the Bus Shelters team have observed that the nearest high frequency stops (References - NC1022 & NC4235) are located on Bury New Road and a lower frequency stop (Reference - NC4220) is located on Rectory Lane. It is recommended that the development should ensure high quality pedestrian routes are maintained to these stops as part of the development. It appears as though all stops can be retained as existing.
- V. It is noted that colleagues within the Metrolink team have provided separate comments dated the 9<sup>th</sup> June 2023.

### II. General Comments

#### Traffic Impact and Transport Modelling Requirements (to be included within a TA)

- I. A description of current baseline traffic conditions in the area.
- II. An analysis of injury accidents during a recent five-year period, commenting on whether there are any underlying patterns of injury accidents that might be affected by the development.

- III. Traffic surveys and queue surveys (weekdays) - scope to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority (LHA), TfGM UTC and HFAS. TfGM UTC can be contacted in respect of the availability of any traffic counts in the area that could be used for the assessment.
- IV. A clear estimate of the level of new traffic likely to be associated with the development, based on an inspection of similar (and similarly-located) developments across the UK (excluding London) via the TRICS (or similar) database. The assessment work should be undertaken using a person-trip approach and applying the appropriate modal share percentages from local Census data. Other methodologies to determine trip rates are acceptable but these should be fully explained in the TA.
- V. A clearly defined methodology for determining the distribution / assignment of development trips onto the network i.e. understanding of where such new traffic is likely to distribute to/from, based on data sources such as Census Journey-to-Work statistics and/or vehicle turning proportions at nearby junctions.
- VI. An assessment of traffic levels and impacts at the specified year of opening of the development, and at a future year at least five years later, with due regard for traffic growth (if any).
- VII. An understanding of the likely impacts of the proposed development considered alongside any other nearby committed developments.
- VIII. In the relevant TA, clear diagrams should be provided illustrating the following elements, each individually:
- Base Flows
  - Committed Development Flows
  - Proposed Flows
  - Proposed Distribution
  - Base plus Committed plus proposed development
  - Future plus Committed plus proposed development
- IX. TfGM HFAS recommends an increase of about 30vehs/hr at a junction as an appropriate threshold for considering the necessity of a traffic impact assessment; this is in preference to a percentage-increase threshold, which tends to favour development in already heavily-trafficked areas.
- X. The scope of the junctions to be assessed by detailed modelling should be agreed with TfGM (UTC) and the LHA in advance and will depend upon the outcome of the trip assessment and distribution exercise. For this reason,

TfGM would advise that a trip generation and distribution exercise should be issued before submission of the planning application. Once this is undertaken it will be possible to finalise TfGM requirements in terms of the TA. This will largely depend on the amount of trip generation.

- XI. Clear details of proposed vehicular access arrangements including general servicing arrangements. An engineering drawing should be supplied showing the changes to the road network to fully understand the impact of the proposed development.
- XII. A swept path analysis should be provided for any vehicular access.
- XIII. A review of Traffic Regulation Orders on the surrounding streets in the vicinity of the development.
- XIV. An assessment of the likely environmental/traffic impacts of HGVs during the construction process.

### III. Site Accessibility by Sustainable Modes

Walking and cycling should form the natural mode choice for shorter trips, and also provide a viable option to facilitate longer trips through providing easy access to public transport. New developments should connect with, and enhance, existing walking and cycling networks in their vicinity, and also provide high quality facilities and networks for walking and cycling within development sites.

The TA should include a comprehensive review of the existing provision in the vicinity of the site for all pedestrians including those with disabilities. In addition to walking distances and pedestrian desire lines, pedestrian environment (including footway condition and widths) and pedestrian safety and security should be considered.

An audit of the footways in the vicinity of the development should be undertaken and improvements identified.

A comprehensive review of the cycling infrastructure in the vicinity of the proposed development should also be undertaken. This should include an assessment of the connectivity of the site with existing cycle routes. The quality and condition of existing infrastructure, cyclist safety and security should also be considered.

The catchment area for cycling, walking and public transport should be captured in maps. The quality of the routes for pedestrians and cyclists should be described and this should include a description of any signing for cycle routes as appropriate.

The TA should provide a review of existing public transport services (including service frequency and location of nearest stations/stops), with a view to supporting improvements to existing public transport services as required, in particular, assess the quality of the surrounding bus infrastructure i.e. upgrade to shelters etc.

The TA should include a plan clearly showing details of the proposed pedestrian and cycle access points serving the site and linkages into the surrounding area. Connectivity with local public transport networks should be highlighted. The applicant should consider measures to encourage access by sustainable modes. Possible measures include but are not limited to the provision of pedestrian crossings, cycleways, cycle parking, new/improved footway ensuring that there are linkages into existing cycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as upgrades to existing bus stops (where appropriate).

TfGM would suggest that a pedestrian survey is carried out in the vicinity of the site, as per guidance <https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/1434/street-review-guidance-for-web.pdf> and included as part of the TA.

It should be highlighted that LTN/120 has been introduced by the DfT and this has changed the requirements for the design of cycling provision.

Details of cycle parking facilities for the proposed development (e.g., number of spaces, location and type) should be provided and shown on plan.

#### IV. Mitigation Measures

Impacts of the development should be identified through the above assessment work. The applicant should identify appropriate mitigation to accommodate any increases in traffic generation and increased pedestrian and cyclist movements. Any appropriate mitigation should be identified in conjunction with TfGM UTC and the LHA who will be happy to work with the applicant to agree an approach.

The TA should consider the impact of the development on the existing public transport networks in terms of extension of bus services, additional person trips. Mitigation measures should be considered where appropriate.

## V. Travel Plan

A Framework Travel Plan for the development should accompany any future planning application.

## VI. Other

If there are any changes planned for bus infrastructure, for example relocation of existing bus stops or the creation of new bus parking areas, TfGM would request that the applicant liaise directly with TfGM's bus infrastructure team who can be contacted at [Shelters@tfgm.com](mailto:Shelters@tfgm.com).

## VII. Suggested Useful Guidance

In relation to walking, the importance of providing and maintaining good quality footways, free from obstruction and wide enough for when they are at their busiest, is critical to encourage and maximise walking levels associated with new developments. Useful guidance on street layouts which encourage walking is provided in Manual for Streets (Department for Transport, 2007). MfS provides guidance on lightly trafficked residential streets, and Manual for Streets 2 (CIHT, 2010) further develops the principles of the first Manual for Streets for application in wider circumstances on busier streets, including town and district centres.

In relation to cycling, infrastructure should be designed in accordance with current Greater Manchester Cycling Design Standards, the latest version of which is available from the TfGM website or by emailing [cycling@tfgm.com](mailto:cycling@tfgm.com). In particular, connections to/from and within developments should be designed in accordance with the Key Design Criteria of Safety, Coherence, Directness, Attractiveness and Comfort. A general principle is that infrastructure should be designed to be attractive to those who do not currently cycle, in order to drive the increase in cycling's mode share.

The Bee Network will be the largest joined-up system of public transport, walking and cycling routes in the UK and has been developed with all 10 Greater Manchester local authorities. More information on this is available on <https://www.tfgm.com> and TfGM would encourage the applicant to review the map online to determine whether there is an opportunity for this development to connect into the proposed Bee Network.

I hope you find these comments useful in the pre-application process. Should you wish to discuss any matter further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully

Claire Smallman  
Infrastructure Development Officer  
Email [claire.smallman@tfgm.com](mailto:claire.smallman@tfgm.com)

Appendix F: Bury Council Highway Officer approval of amended Transport Assessment Methodology

Appendix G: Bury Council Highway Officers Comments on Adoption Strategy and Civic Engineers' Response

Appendix H: TfGM Comments on Transport Assessment Scoping Note dated 5 October 2023, including Civic Engineers' Response

## Emily Ingham

---

**From:** Bland, David <D.Bland@bury.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 24 October 2023 12:48  
**To:** Emily Ingham  
**Cc:** Crossland, Rachel; Liz McFadyean; Stokes, Peter; Leah Stuart; Paul Morris  
**Subject:** RE: 02850/E: Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich - TfGM Ref: 23/196 - TfGM views on Transport Assessment Scoping Note v. 1.0  
**Attachments:** image006.emz  
**Categories:** Filed by Newforma

Emily  
That sounds fine.

If the trends indicate no growth, we just need to ensure we explain how we have arrived at the figures we have and why we have made the assumptions that we have.

**David Bland**  
**Lead Engineer**  
**Bury Council**  
**3 Knowsley Place**  
**Duke Street**  
**BL9 0EJ**

Please note my normal working days are Monday and Thursday



---

**From:** Emily Ingham <emily.ingham@civicengineers.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 24, 2023 11:07 AM  
**To:** Bland, David <D.Bland@bury.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** Crossland, Rachel <R.Crossland@bury.gov.uk>; Liz McFadyean <liz.mcfadyean@asteerplanning.com>; Stokes, Peter <P.Stokes@bury.gov.uk>; Leah Stuart <leah@civicengineers.com>; Paul Morris <paul@civicengineers.com>  
**Subject:** RE: 02850/E: Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich - TfGM Ref: 23/196 - TfGM views on Transport Assessment Scoping Note v. 1.0

Thank you for responding David.

I have addressed the two elements you raised below, please can you get back to me to confirm this is acceptable:

#### Traffic Counts vs. TRICS for Trip Gen of Existing Occupied Land Uses in the Red Line

The purpose of using TRICS to estimate existing trip generation of occupied uses within the red line is to then net those off the base traffic flows, as they will be replaced in the future by the trip generation of the proposed development, and avoids double counting. I had avoided making assumptions based on what currently happens at the car park, as it is obviously difficult to know where people are going who park in the car parks and had wanted to be as robust as possible by not overestimating the trips to be netted.

However, I have done a study of the count data following your suggestion. As per the parking calculations you have previously approved, if we assume that 40% of the people parking in the car parks visit land uses within the red line boundary, we would be netting off fewer trips in the peak hour, particularly in the PM peak. Therefore, your suggestion would net off fewer trips. **We are happy to take this approach.**

The table below sets this out, with the trips we :

|                                                                                                               | Weekday PM Peak Hour<br>(0730-0830) |           |           | Weekday Peak Hour<br>(1730-1830) |           |           | Saturday Peak Hour<br>(1415-1515) |           |  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|
| Average surveyed                                                                                              | 57                                  | 38        | 96        | 69                               | 48        | 117       | 135                               | 144       |  |
| <b>Assuming 40% of surveyed traffic are visiting uses within red line (to be used in updated methodology)</b> | <b>23</b>                           | <b>15</b> | <b>38</b> | <b>28</b>                        | <b>19</b> | <b>47</b> | <b>54</b>                         | <b>58</b> |  |
| Trip rate of occupied land uses in red line from TRICS (previously used in TA to net off existing trips)      | 30                                  | 13        | 43        | 50                               | 61        | 111       | 70                                | 68        |  |



#### Traffic Growth/No-Growth


On 20 October we received the following follow-up comment from TfGM in response to my purple text from the email you wrote your red text in. I have added our response.

**TfGM Comments:** [Quoting Civic Engineers' response] 'A no-growth scenario has been accepted by Richard Dolphin at TfGM for Stretford Kingsway, indeed a 8% reduction in background traffic was accepted. We therefore do not intend to model background growth.' UTC (TfGM) have highlighted that each development is appraised on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, as the Stretford development is in Trafford, not Bury, and had specific circumstances that were related to that site, it is considered that this is not relevant to this development. The LHA and LPA agree with the need to assess proposals need to be judged on their own merits. In this regard we advise that you will need to model what you actually think/believe/ expect will happen based on the surrounding local highway network.

**Civic Engineers' Response:** agreed. The highway network will be modelled as per the situation in the area, which as the graphs submitted show, does not indicate there has been traffic growth on the network, and therefore background traffic growth will not be added. Note that Stretford was mentioned to demonstrate there was precedence for no-growth scenarios being modelled and acceptable to TfGM, not that Civic Engineers is assuming the traffic situation is consistent across Greater Manchester, and we are able to demonstrate there is no local case for adding growth.

David, you mentioned that you expect to see growth modelled, but what growth period/proportion would that be? There has been no evidence of traffic growth in the past (see downward trend at all three of the nearest DfT counts in the graphs below) and therefore modelling that it will occur in the future, in the context of policy which supports sustainable mode shift, and investment in non-car modes, would not seem a likely scenario. We therefore propose not to add growth, based on evidence from the surrounding area, the approach suggested by TfGM.





Thank you for getting back to me, please can you confirm these final points.  
Kind regards,  
Emily


**Emily Ingham**

Associate

Tel: 0113 2025 130

DDI: 01132025147

My work days are: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday only



**Proud Winners of "Best Place to Work"**  
**2023 New Civil Engineer Awards!**

*Please do not print this email unless it is necessary. Every unprinted email helps the environment.*

Civic Engineers is a trading name of Civic Engineers Limited (registered number 06824088) which is a limited company registered in England and Wales. Registered address Carver's Warehouse, 77 Dale Street, Manchester, M1 2HG. For email disclaimer, please click [here](#)

**From:** Bland, David <[D.Bland@bury.gov.uk](mailto:D.Bland@bury.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** Monday, October 23, 2023 4:53 PM

**To:** Emily Ingham <[emily.ingham@civicingineers.com](mailto:emily.ingham@civicingineers.com)>

Cc: Crossland, Rachel <[R.Crossland@bury.gov.uk](mailto:R.Crossland@bury.gov.uk)>; Stokes, Peter <[P.Stokes@bury.gov.uk](mailto:P.Stokes@bury.gov.uk)>

Subject: RE: 02850/E: Prestwich Village Centre, (Longfield Centre site), Prestwich - TfGM Ref: 23/196 - TfGM views on Transport Assessment Scoping Note v. 1.0

Emily

With regards to points raised and questions asked -see comments in red below

### 5.1 - Vehicle Trip Generation of Existing Use

This exercise uses TRICS rate to establish current uses. TfGM would query why surveys have not been used? The access points should be surveyed and the relevant car share can be determined from Census data and a vehicle number calculated. Surveys would also help to understand the general movement patterns in the area. *We have a lot of surveys from the car park accesses, however, we can't use these to estimate the vehicle trip generation of the existing uses within the red line boundary (which will be replaced as part of this development and therefore need netting off the background traffic flows) because, as you note below, the car parks are also used by visitors to other parts of the town centre and Metrolink customers. Therefore the survey data does not capture the trip rate of the existing land uses in isolation. TRICS has been used for the existing land uses, which is a widely applied approach, including for vacant sites.*

In this same section the TA states : *"It is assumed that as many of the local shops are currently vacant, that only 50% of them are generating traffic. Furthermore, 30% of the trips to the local shops and the Iceland have been netted off as they will be part of a linked trip to other land uses within or out with the red line boundary. As set out below the table, this has been checked against the observed use of the car parks on the survey days, and is considered appropriate."* TfGM would advise that observing the existing car parks will not help produce an existing trip pattern for the development area. Those existing car parks will also include trips destined for uses outside the development area, for example the Marks and Spencer store, Croma restaurant and Costa Coffee store. *I think this is a misunderstanding and we will rephrase in the TA. We are not using the existing use of the car parks to estimate the trip generation of the existing land uses within the red line boundary (for the reasons you have given here, and the reason I gave in purple above), as explained in the above point.*

*Bury would expect to see actual count data- you state you have, so can we please see. I would suggest it is then caveated around points you have made*

Page 11 of the TA states that, *"A sense check of the car trips derived from TRICS was carried against the arrivals and departures at the Fairfax Road and Longfield car parks."* It is not clear what the sense check involves, what methodology and / or data has been used? *I will make this clearer.*

**Noted**

### 5.2 - Vehicle Trip Generation of Proposed Use

The TA states that some town centre locations have been used in the TRICS analysis. TfGM do not consider town centres comparable to the location assessed in the TA. Same applied for edge of town centres. We advise the use of suburban areas as a starting point. *The development is itself a town centre, and there are similar town centres included in the TRICS surveys. What's more, the development will reinvigorate the centre, so this location type is appropriate.*

*We would consider approach taken – consider as a town centre -to be acceptable and appropriate*

### 5.3 - Net Vehicle Trip Generation

The TA states that, *"Note that currently, only trips from the occupied portion of the existing development within the red line boundary has been netted off. For the Transport Assessment, the trip generation of the full extant development GFA within the red line will be netted off, as there is no planning reason why the full existing*

*development could not be re-occupied, and therefore the proposals should be compared against the consented impact of the development.*” TfGM would ask if the buildings are in a good state of repair and if in practice they could be brought back into use. If they are not then the full existing complement should not be netted off. It is standard practice to net off the full approved/exant development area of the existing buildings. This is carried out for vacant sites as well, and therefore the proportion that is occupied, and its state of repair is not material. Please confirm. This approach was agreed with TfGM at fully vacant sites on Upper Brook Street, Manchester and for partially vacant sites such as Stretford Mall, and therefore this same approach will be applied for Prestwich redevelopment.

Nevertheless, the current approach for calculating existing trips is unacceptable to us as written in Paragraph 2 above. There is no operational reason as to why counts cannot be collected around the development which is well constrained by the highway and access points. As mentioned by me in response to the first point above, and by TfGM in the second point, surveys at the car park cannot be used to estimate the trip rate of the existing land uses, which is why TRICS has been used, as is standard practice.

We’d expect to see actual count data as detailed above

## 7.2 – Trip Distribution

The TA states that, *“The proposed development trips were distributed to and from the Fairfax Road car park, as this is where development parking will be consolidated. These were applied to the network using the turning proportions into and out of the existing Fairfax Road car park as observed in the surveys at the Fairfax Road/Rectory Lane and A56/Fairfax Road junctions during the Friday 23 June 2023 and Saturday 17 June 2023 surveys.”* As a methodology, this is acceptable providing that TROs will be in place in the surrounding area to prevent on road parking unless resident in the immediate area. Is this being fully reviewed, as the development trip patterns will be primarily dependant on parking arrangements even beyond those located in close vicinity of the development. Noted that TfGM accept that vehicle trips will be distributed as per the existing turning proportions at the surveyed junctions.

Noted

## 8.1 - Background Traffic Flow in Study Area

TfGM do not agree with the TA approach of not applying growth factors to traffic flows. TfGM have checked the data from a permanent count located along the A56 near the study area and 2023 flows are higher than those recorded in previous years. The TA states that not applying growth factors was recently adopted and agreed with TfGM for scenario testing of Kingsway in Stretford, Trafford. It is not clear to HFAS to what testing the TA refers to, but it is considered that this should not be adopted for this development. It does not align with policy to include background vehicle growth, as it contradicts the aims of TfGM in the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 for 50% of trips to be by walking, cycling and public transport by 2040. To be serious about meeting policy aims, we can’t be trying to accommodate traffic growth that would undermine adopted policy aims. A no-growth scenario has been accepted by Richard Dolphin at TfGM for Stretford Kingsway, indeed a 8% reduction in background traffic was accepted. We therefore do not intend to model background growth. Please also see below peak hour traffic counts from the DfT website for the three locations around the development, showing that background traffic is reducing/remaining steady, indicating further evidence that it would not be appropriate to model background growth, along with the other trends discussed in the TA Scoping Note as submitted.

We’d expect to see traffic growth factored in. Once again this should be then caveated around 2040 and aim for zero traffic growth of private vehicles

**David Bland**  
**Lead Engineer**  
**Bury Council**

2772

Prestwich

Response to Highways Comments Received 3<sup>rd</sup> November '23

9<sup>th</sup> November 2023



| Item | Comments received from Paul Holmes of Bury Council on 3 <sup>rd</sup> November 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Design team response 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | <p>There are concerns regarding the introduction of vehicular access/HGV service vehicles onto the existing adopted pedestrianised areas of Poppythorn Lane where none (other than occasional maintenance/emergency service vehicles) are currently encountered by pedestrians. We feel that this could well lead to objections to the planning application (and in-parallel stopping-up order) and to the principle of 'upgrading' of these routes to vehicular use (unlike the examples mentioned to us where it appears that streets have been effectively 'downgraded' with vehicular use reduced). The ability to service the new development from other points onto Rectory Lane should be explored.</p> | <p>Alternative options have been tested with access being provided directly to and from Rectory Lane however this would result in the requirement for large vehicles to reverse and turn within the heart of the development. These maneuvers are shown on Civic Engineers drawings 4001 and 4002 appended.</p> <p>We propose to continue with the Pedestrian Zone solution currently shown with vehicular access in restricted hours to be confirmed. An alternative servicing scenario would be available outside of these hours with vehicles accessing from Bury New Road and maneuvering in the proposed turning space. This maneuver is also shown on the above referenced drawings.</p> |
| 2    | <p>We would suggest that the minimum retained footway width on Bury New Road to the rear of the existing bus shelter should be around 2.5-3m or so in width, outside of the footprint of the shelter. The limits should therefore be extended to the east as far as practicable so that the existing trees, especially the northerly one that is located closer to Bury New Road, are retained within the proposed rain garden areas, with these areas reconfigured so that they are located clear of the future adopted highway limits.</p>                                                                                                                                                                   | <p>The proposed extents of adoption has been adjusted to maintain a minimum 2.5m footway to the rear of the bus shelter. The revised proposals are shown on Civic Engineers drawing 10025 appended.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

|   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                  |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3 | The existing service yard to be converted into a shared parking/service/bin storage area served from the southerly bend in Rectory Lane would not be suitable for adoption, especially as the information submitted shows that the larger refuse collection vehicle cannot now enter and leave this area in a forward gear, unless additional land is secured (which is an issue that needs to be considered in any event before this service area is used for the new purposes proposed)                                                                             | The proposed extents of adoption have been amended as requested and are shown on Civic Engineers' drawing 10025. |
| 4 | The proposed footway to the north of the above shared parking/service/bin storage area/south of the Community Hub would also not be suitable for adoption as, due to the alterations to the adopted highway limits on Bury New Road, would not form a continuous link from Rectory Lane to Bury New Road.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | The proposed extents of adoption have been amended as requested and are shown on Civic Engineers' drawing 10025. |
| 5 | Due to the above, the extent of adopted highways to be stopped-up would need to be reconsidered with a footway parallel to the bend retained. The width/position of the footway to be retained can be the subject of a further discussion, reflecting the existing limits of adoption on both sides of the service yard access, need to retain adequate levels of visibility at the junction within the limits of adoption, footway widths on both sides of/approaches the bend, limits of the proposed rain garden clear of the adopted highway where possible, etc. | The proposed extents of adoption have been amended as requested and are shown on Civic Engineers' drawing 10025. |
| 6 | There is a need to liaise with GMFRS in view of the multiple access points and routes being proposed for fire tender access, including locations where it may not be practicably possible/safe to allow vehicular access, e.g., through the existing bus layby on Bury New Road, immediately at the existing pelican crossing on Fairfax Road and via the tactile paving, etc.                                                                                                                                                                                        | Consultation with the Fire Service will be undertaken.                                                           |

|    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7  | In association with the above, the need for/type of 'dropped bollards' (PAS rated – please confirm?) would need to be clarified as well as, if raise and lower bollards are proposed (but ideally not telescopic), whether the one(s) located on the adopted highway could be maintained by the same company/entity that will be maintaining the proposed 'non-adopted' areas.                                                          | Noted. We would anticipate that this will be resolved through the Development Access & Management Strategy which we expect would be Conditioned as part of the Planning Application.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 8  | Who would have control of the proposed bollards, both on and off the highway?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | As above the approach is to be confirmed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 9  | It would be the Highway Authority's preference for the proposed rain gardens to be adopted by United Utilities, so would appreciate if this could be pursued by the development team.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Noted. The design team will discuss this approach with UU. We would welcome the opportunity to speak to the relevant people at Bury Council regarding the approach to maintenance in case UU adoption is not feasible. The maintenance is no more onerous than a traditional gully system and grass verge.                                                                                                                        |
| 10 | In view of the proposal to provide remote parking for the vast majority of the development, what proposals are there to upgrade the existing crossing facility on Fairfax Road and pedestrian route(s) to the Phase 1(b) part of the development as part of the Phase 1(a) works?                                                                                                                                                       | Allowance has been made for upgrading the crossing facilities on Fairfax Road. The detail will need to be Agreed with Bury Council and TfGM. We understand that wider connectivity is focus of a separate study funded by TfGM.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 11 | Can a partial traffic calming scheme be implemented on Rectory Lane? The only physical measure on the Rectory Lane route (other than red Textureflex banding and slow markings) is the raised crossing at the pedestrian access to Prestwich Metrolink.                                                                                                                                                                                 | It is feasible to introduce raised tables in isolation on the highways network. As mentioned a raised crossing already exists on Rectory Lane adjacent to the Metrolink station. It is likely that the raised table will not be installed in the initial phases of development but will be completed at a later date along with the carriageway works associated with Phase 2. This is to avoid damage during Construction works. |
| 12 | It is proposed to formalise a crossing point across Rectory Lane along the line of the Poppythorn Lane route, to the north of the existing tactile paved crossing point that has been designed to minimise any pedestrian crossing/vehicle turning conflicts, which is reflected by the off-set crossing position and provision of bollard and rails. Should this be reconsidered in view of the safety issues that this would present? | This has been tracked and vehicular access does not conflict directly with the crossing point This will be tested further once detailed design of this section commences and revised if necessary.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |

|    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13 | The nose-in parking proposed close to the bend are unusual features on the adopted highway and should be changed to a parallel lay-by, even if this results in the loss of a few spaces.                                                                                    | We don't feel that perpendicular parking is a particularly unusual feature and is promoted through Manual Streets as contributing to traffic calming. The visibility at the bend has been tested and we do not feel presents an issue. At the appropriate point we would propose a Safety Audit and refinement to the design if required.                                                                                        |
| 14 | Interim servicing/access arrangements for the new development for the interim period between Phases 1(b) and 2 would need to be clarified (I believe that they are a 'Work In Progress').                                                                                   | A drawing will be produced to illustrate how Phase 1 will be serviced in advance of the Phase 2 works being completed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 15 | Parking provision and allocation will need to be clarified and indeed justified in due course. Any off-site mitigation measures as a result of the development may well be needed and/or conditioned (e.g., Residents parking scheme(s) in the adjacent residential areas). | The parking strategy has been discussed and agreed in principle with Bury Council's David Bland. The strategy will be described in detail along with justification in the development Transport Assessment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 16 | Has the removal of the bus lay-by on Rectory Lane been agreed with the appropriate section of TfGM?                                                                                                                                                                         | The bus stop is shown to remain with buses stopping on carriageway rather than in a lay-by. This has not been discussed with TfGM at this stage but we expect would be well received as it avoids the risk of buses becoming "stuck" in the layby allowing for more efficient running. When consultation occurs at the appropriate time the layby could be straightforwardly introduced through the detailed design if required. |
| 17 | I presume that the need to accommodate GMFRS's vehicles at Highfield Place is not a Highway Authority issue as this highway is not adopted? Please could this be clarified.                                                                                                 | This is currently being reviewed by Bury Council.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |

### Drawings Appended

2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40001 WIP Refuse Vehicle Tracking Poppythorn Lane

2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40002 WIP Rigid Vehicle Tracking Poppythorn Lane


2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-10013 Proposed Extents of Adoption



STANDARD NOTES

1. THIS DRAWING IS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL RELEVANT ARCHITECT'S AND ENGINEER'S DRAWINGS AND THE SPECIFICATIONS.
2. THIS DRAWING SHOULD NOT BE SCALED.
3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE VERIFIED BY THE CONTRACTOR ON SITE.
4. ALL DISCREPANCIES SHOULD BE REPORTED TO C.A./E.A. PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF WORKS.

© CIVIC ENGINEERS LIMITED



|                                         |         |
|-----------------------------------------|---------|
| Phoenix 2-25W (with Volvo FM12 chassis) | 11.125m |
| Overall Length                          | 2.530m  |
| Overall Width                           | 3.205m  |
| Overall Body Height                     | 0.410m  |
| Min Body Ground Clearance               | 2.500m  |
| Track Width                             | 4.00s   |
| Lock to lock time                       | 9.250m  |
| Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius             |         |


# WIP

| DATE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | REV        | DESCRIPTION  | DRAWN | CHKD        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------|-------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |            |              |       |             |
| <p><b>MANCHESTER</b> Carver's Warehouse, 77 Dale Street, Manchester, M1 2HG. Tel: 0161 228 6757<br/><b>LONDON</b> Reeds Wharf, 33 Mill Street, London SE1 2AX. Tel: 020 7253 2977<br/><b>LEEDS</b> 1 Saw Mill Street, Water Lane, Leeds, LS11 5WE. Tel: 0113 2025 130<br/><b>GLASGOW</b> 35 Virginia Street, Glasgow, G1 1TH. Tel: 0141 370 809</p> <p><a href="http://www.civicengineers.com">www.civicengineers.com</a></p> |            |              |       |             |
| PROJECT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |            |              |       |             |
| MUSE, PRESTWICH                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |            |              |       |             |
| TITLE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |            |              |       |             |
| REFUSE VEHICLE TRACKING<br>SERVICE YARD                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |            |              |       |             |
| DRAWING STATUS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |            |              |       | STATUS CODE |
| INFORMATION                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |            |              |       |             |
| CE PROJECT No.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | SCALE @ A1 | DATE CREATED | DRAWN | CHECKED     |
| 2772                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 1:250      | MAY '23      | ZH    | KY          |
| DRAWING No.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |            |              |       | REV         |
| 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40001                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |            |              |       | P04         |



FILE LOCATION PATH: \\FS01\PROJECTS\DRIVE\PROJECTS\HOT\2772 MUSE - PRESTWICH\CH\004 BIM\TRANSPORT\2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40001\_40002 - SERVICE YARD TRACKING.DWG

FILE LOCATION PATH: \\S01\PROJECTS\DRIVE\PROJECTS HOT\2772 MUSE - PRESTWICH\CH\004 BIM\TRANSPORT\2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40001\_40002 - SERVICE YARD TRACKING.DWG



STANDARD NOTES

1. THIS DRAWING IS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ALL RELEVANT ARCHITECT'S AND ENGINEER'S DRAWINGS AND THE SPECIFICATIONS.
2. THIS DRAWING SHOULD NOT BE SCALED.
3. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE VERIFIED BY THE CONTRACTOR ON SITE.
4. ALL DISCREPANCIES SHOULD BE REPORTED TO C.A./E.A. PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF WORKS.

© CIVIC ENGINEERS LIMITED



|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Overall Length              | 10.000m |
| Overall Width               | 2.500m  |
| Overall Body Height         | 3.632m  |
| Min Body Ground Clearance   | 0.427m  |
| Track Width                 | 2.500m  |
| Lock to lock time           | 4.00s   |
| Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius | 12.000m |

# WIP

| DATE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | REV        | DESCRIPTION  | DRAWN | CHKD        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------|-------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |            |              |       |             |
| <small>MANCHESTER Carver's Warehouse, 77 Dale Street, Manchester, M1 2HG. Tel: 0161 228 6757<br/>LONDON Reeds Wharf, 33 Mill Street, London SE1 2AX. Tel: 020 7253 2977<br/>LEEDS 1 Saw Mill Street, Water Lane, Leeds, LS11 5WZ. Tel: 0113 2025 130<br/>GLASGOW 35 Virginia Street, Glasgow, G1 1TH. Tel: 0141 370 8809</small> |            |              |       |             |
| <a href="http://www.civicengineers.com">www.civicengineers.com</a>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |            |              |       |             |
| PROJECT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |            |              |       |             |
| MUSE, PRESTWICH                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |            |              |       |             |
| TITLE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |            |              |       |             |
| RIGID VEHICLE TRACKING<br>SERVICE YARD                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |            |              |       |             |
| DRAWING STATUS                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |            |              |       | STATUS CODE |
| INFORMATION                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |            |              |       |             |
| CE PROJECT No.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | SCALE @ A1 | DATE CREATED | DRAWN | CHECKED     |
| 2772                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 1:250      | MAY '23      | ZH    | KY          |
| DRAWING No.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |            |              |       | REV         |
| 2772-CIV-XX-XX-D-H-40002                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |            |              |       | P04         |