

Our Ref: 2772

Prestwich Village planning reference: 70449

Response to Comments Pertaining to Transport and Highways

3 April 2024, version 1.1

The following note provides response to comments received in relation to transport and highways aspects of the hybrid planning application (70449) for Prestwich Village.

These are addressed in the table below in the following order:

- TfGM Metrolink (16 February 2024)
- TfGM Highways comments (19 February 2024)
- Active Travel England (27 February 2024)
- Bury Council highway officers (20 March 2024)
- Planning Policy response

Note that a schedule of cycle parking is provided at the end of this note as requested. Cycle parking provision for the full element of the application is set out, benchmarked against Bury Council adopted policy requirements and LTN1/20. In summary the requirements of both are met by the development proposals. The study considers only cycle parking proposed on plot and in the landscaping, it doesn't include the significant amount of cycle parking proposed in the Travel Hub (76 spaces) therefore the cycle parking provision proposed is considered appropriate, sufficient and aspirational in supporting cycle journeys.

TfGM Metrolink (16 February 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Request for upgrades to Prestwich Metrolink stop.	Comments will be addressed by the JV, but for context, the increase in tram passengers at the Prestwich stop will be 79 in the AM peak and 106 in the PM peak, then a lower number per hour across the course of a day. This would be approx. 10-12 max additional passengers per service in the peak hours.	

TfGM Highways comments (19 February 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Parking – TfGM set out the parking provision and defer to Bury Council to confirm if parking provision is adequate to meet Bury Council requirements	Comment addressed to LPA.	
Trip Generation – TfGM restate that they would have preferred if town centre sites from TRICS were not.	Bury Council highway officers accepted during pre-application discussions with David Bland by email that town centre sites were acceptable to include. This dialogue was included in the Transport Assessment at Appendix F.	
Traffic Growth and Traffic Flow Diagrams. As stated during the pre-application discussions, TfGM requested that background traffic growth be included, however defer to Bury Council.	As requested by David Bland during pre-application discussions by email, a study was carried out into the local situation to understand background traffic growth trends. There has been no background traffic growth in this area and therefore growth was not added as there is no justification to do so. David Bland agreed with this approach by email and this dialogue was included in the Transport Assessment at Appendix F.	
Traffic Regulation Orders – TfGM suggest that TROs be introduced to deter on-street parking.	In the Transport Assessment it is proposed that the developer will review on-street parking pre- and post-occupation and carry out consultation on introduction/amendment of TROs if required.	

TfGM Highways comments (19 February 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Other – Construction Management Plan required.	It is understood this will be a planning condition.	
Junction modelling – TfGM requested that the LinSig traffic model of the A56 Bury New Road/Fairfax Road junction be amended and have indicated what revisions were required.	The updated modelling was completed and a summary note and modelling file sent to the planning officer who forwarded to TfGM. The findings of the Transport Assessment were unchanged by the adjustment to the modelling approach, i.e. the impact of the development at the junction would not be significant. TfGM emailed the planning officer and highway officer on 19 March to confirm that following the updated modelling, they agree with the conclusion of the Transport Assessment that the impact of the development is not significant.	

Active Travel England (27 February 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Consideration given to the appropriate contributions from the development that will deliver improvements to pedestrian and cycle access to the site, with particular focus and importance required on improvements to Bury New Road, Fairfax Road and the junction of these roads.	As set out in the Transport Assessment this is subject to a separate programme of works proposed by Bury Council to address pedestrian connectivity in the area.	

Active Travel England (27 February 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Increase in the number of secure cycle parking spaces serving the Retail Hub to a minimum of 17. Confirmation that these will be covered	The attached cycle parking provision study, benchmarking the proposals against LTN 1/20 parking requirements, indicates that the provision proposed is sufficient. There will also be significant cycle parking available in the Travel Hub (76 spaces) which can be used by visitors and staff if more is in demand.	
Greater detail on the approach to cycle parking at the Travel Hub and how this will be managed so as to be secure but also available to the general public. Confirmation that CCTV will be included within the cycle store room	The cycle store room will be covered by CCTV as per secure by design requirements, and the external wall to the cycle store will be perforate metal / mesh. This will allow views into and out of the cycle store.	
At the Community Hub the two non-standard cycle parking spaces should be marked/signed as reserved for non-standard cycles	This is acceptable and a good idea.	

Active Travel England (27 February 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Agreement to a condition to deliver 1 secure, covered cycle parking space per bedroom at each of the residential phases of the development. This condition should require full details of the cycle parking to be submitted at reserved matters stage	This can be addressed at reserved matters stage for the residential plots, however it should be noted that 1:1 would be a significant overprovision, representing a large area of the residential plots which could be used for other residential amenity. Requiring 1:1 assumes that every single resident will have a bike (as the request is 1 per bedroom not 1 per home), which is not realistic. With such good public transport links, and being on the doorstep of the village centre, 100% of people wanting to cycle is not likely. What's more, even with a dramatic shift towards cycling, the Propensity to Cycle tool https://www.pct.bike/ indicates that in this area, cycling would be at 27% at most. Bury Council standards require cycle parking within the curtilage of houses, which is acceptable, and 1:5 for apartments. Therefore, an alternative provision for resident cycle parking could be proposed, between the 1:1 requested by ATE and 1:5 required by Bury Council policy. This can be discussed at reserved matters stage for the residential plots.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
General Comments		
In terms of servicing, it is proposed to continue with the 'Pedestrian Zone solution', with vehicular access in restricted hours (to be confirmed) within 'Prestwich Village', controlled by removable bollards, with the type of bollard and operational strategy to be determined via a Development Access & Management Strategy secured by a suitably worded planning condition. The Highway Authority have, again as confirmed at pre-application stage, significant concerns regarding this, but these views were dismissed by the design team – refer to page 30 and the Appendices of the Transport Assessment. Whilst tracking details are submitted in the above Transport Assessment, they only show how and where service vehicles will turn outside of controlled hours.	To clarify, as set out in the Transport Assessment, there will not be a continuous vehicle access route on Poppythorne Lane, which will remain pedestrianised as existing. This strategy was updated following consultation with highway officers. The tracking drawings provided in the TA show vehicles turning at either end to avoid having to drive along Poppythorne Lane.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Has a detailed, proposed site plan of the 'full component' of this application/first phases (i.e., Plot A Community and Retail Hub, Plot B Retail and Commercial Hub, Plot C Market Hall and Plot G Travel Hub) been prepared on a topographical survey-based site plan rather than the largely diagrammatic plans submitted? Or is it considered acceptable for this level of detail to be submitted for the full aspects of this hybrid application? If it is considered acceptable, many aspects will need to be conditioned like we did for the Radcliffe Hub proposals	All proposals have been drawn based on a topographical survey and we would anticipate conditions requiring submission of Section 278 and Section 38 proposals for technical approval.	
Whilst it is stated that this will be undertaken, has GMFRS been consulted/liased with to confirm what their requirements are in relation to accessing both the existing properties (especially high rise development at The Radius) and the new development? This will include how the proposed bollard arrangements would be managed, etc. and their access secured in the event of an incident.	A Fire Strategy document has been produced for each of the plots which form part of the full planning application. Consultation with GMFRS on the Fire Strategy will be carried out during the building control sign off stage.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
Due to the remote parking solution being proposed and need for all pedestrians to now cross the busy Fairfax Road, have TfGM been consulted on what upgrades are needed to the existing pedestrian crossing and has a Safety Audit been undertaken to fully assess the risks to users of the Travel Hub due to a lack of in-curtilage parking facilities.	Allowance has been made for improvements to the existing signalised pedestrian crossing on Fairfax Road. A safety audit hasn't been undertaken at this stage as the crossing has not yet been designed and other works to Fairfax Road are minimal. We would expect these works to be conditioned as part of the Section 278 works. TfGM have been consulted throughout although there have been no specific discussions with regard to upgrades to the crossing on Fairfax Road, other than those relating to the designs being undertaken by TfGM on the wider connections. TfGM will be consulted when the upgrade of the existing signalised pedestrian crossing on Fairfax Road is being designed.	
1. Parking		
This is being addressed separately via meetings and other supporting information.		

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
2. Trip Generation		
Quoting TfGM's comment "TfGM are of the view that if the Bury Local Authority boundary is taken into consideration on its own, then Bury Town Centre would be the town centre location and not Prestwich. Using town centre sites is not representative of the future development location and leads to the determination of trip rates that are lower than what would be anticipated for such a location." This point has been made previously by TfGM and needs to be responded to in order for the LPA & HA to take a view on this issue and to see if the methodology suggested would have an adverse impact on the adjacent Key Route Network.	This was raised during pre-application discussions by email between Civic Engineers and David Bland. Town centre locations were deemed acceptable and the methodology of the Transport Assessment continued on this basis. The dialogue including this agreement is included at Appendix F.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
3. Traffic Growth		
Quoting TfGM's comment "In terms of traffic growth, TfGM maintain their previous comment that traffic growth should be applied to the assessments. Growth including 2023 is shown by the permanent data count data located in the vicinity of the development." We would agree with the stance taken by TfGM. In order for the LPA/HA to take a view on this issue, this needs to be responded to and figures/numbers/impact on queues on the Key Route Network submitted to determine whether the applicant's highway consultant's proposed approach is acceptable.	As requested by David Bland during pre-application discussions by email, a study was carried out into the local situation to understand background traffic growth trends. There has been no background traffic growth in this area and therefore growth was not added, as there is no justification to do so. Further information and details of the study is provided at Section 7.2 of the Transport Assessment. David Bland agreed with this approach by email and this dialogue was included in the Transport Assessment at Appendix F.	
4. Traffic Flow Diagrams		
Quoting TfGM's comment "In terms of the traffic flow diagrams TfGM cannot consider the traffic flow diagrams valid as they do not include appropriate traffic growth." We would agree that this needs to be addressed.	As above, there is no basis for including background traffic growth, and details were provided in the Transport Assessment section 7.2.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
5. Transport Assessment		
Quoting TfGM's comment "Appropriate Traffic Regulation Orders should be introduced to deter on-road parking in the areas surrounding the development." This is mentioned in the Transport Assessment and, in keeping with all similar scale developments, will be the subject of a pre-commencement condition in the event that planning consent is granted.	Agreed.	
6. Other		
Quoting TfGM "A robust Construction Traffic Management Plan should be employed as part of the development." This will be the subject of a pre-commencement condition in the event that planning consent is granted. Quoting TfGM "In terms of proposed land-uses, we would ask the local authority to confirm that the final proposed land-use breakdown is as listed in the latest TA as this has changed since the scoping stage. Perhaps a condition could be introduced to limit the development strictly to the land-uses listed in the TA." One for the LPA to impose.	No comment.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
7. Junction Modelling		
Quoting TfGM "The LINSIG modelling needs corrected before it is able to show correctly the impact of the development." We would agree that this needs to be addressed.	The updated modelling was completed and a summary note and modelling file sent to the planning officer who forwarded to TfGM. The findings of the Transport Assessment were unchanged by the adjustment to the modelling approach, i.e. the impact of the development at the junction would not be significant. TfGM emailed the planning officer and highway officer on 19 March to confirm that following the updated modelling, they agree with the conclusion of the Transport Assessment that the impact of the development is not significant.	
8. Accessibility – Public Transport		
The TA states that 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. This will be the subject of a condition on the both the full and outline components in the event that planning consent is granted.	Understood.	
9. Accessibility – Active Travel		
The HA quotes sections of the Active Travel England response stating: The HA agrees with these observations.		

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
ATE comment: <i>In order to maximise the benefits of the site's location, it should be ensured that the pedestrian and cycling environment, within and around the site, is designed to be as safe, attractive and convenient as possible, including natural surveillance where possible. This should provide sufficient links to the surrounding pedestrian and cycle networks. Pedestrian access to the site is limited by the lack of any signalised pedestrian facilities at the junction of Bury New Road – Fairfax Road. These should be provided by the developer.</i> <i>It is noted that there have been two pedestrian KSIs at this junction. Note that there are no funded plans to add signalised pedestrian facilities to the junction.</i> Whilst (a different part of) TfGM are looking at junction improvement here, due to the close proximity of the site to this junction and pedestrian movement that this development will generate across the A56, proposals to upgrade the identified junction needs to form part of the off-site mitigation measures required of this proposal, secured through a pre-commencement condition in the event that planning consent is granted or via the S106 Agreement.	As discussed in the pre-application stage, it is understood that a separate programme of upgrades to pedestrian crossing on the A56 in this area is proposed, and therefore these are not proposed by the application.	

Bury Council highway officer (20 March 2024)	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
ATE comment: <i>Any footways less than 2.0 metres are sub-standard and not providing enough width for pedestrians and other users of the footways. This issue should be addressed as part of the development. Provision of continuous 2-metre-wide footways throughout and surrounding the development.</i>	Understood.	
ATE comment: <i>From the information provide the cycle access to the site is poor – provision should be made for improving the cycle infrastructure for accessing the site.</i>	Changes to Rectory Lane will provide a calmer traffic environment which will be more pleasant for cycling.	
ATE comment: <i>Cycle parking – how the short-stay cycle parking is to be kept safe and secure should be explicitly described.</i>	Short-stay cycle parking will be provided within the landscaping to be conveniently located close to building accesses. It is likely this will be covered by CCTV, to be confirmed during detailed design.	
10. Accessibility – Travel Plan		
<i>To encourage sustainable travel choices, it is important that the development is accompanied by a full Travel Plan with effective measures for bringing about modal shift.</i> This will be the subject of a condition on the both the full and outline components in the event that planning consent is granted.	Framework Travel Plan submitted with the planning application which includes a proactive strategy to encourage and enable sustainable travel choice. It is understood that a condition will be in place to secure the evolution of the Travel Plan and its implementation.	

Planning Policy	Civic Engineers' Response:	Consultee Response:
The Transport Assessment will need to be updated to consider air quality impacts on Holcroft Moss, within the Manchester Mosses Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Should the proposals result in increased traffic flows on the M62 past Holcroft Moss of more than 100 vehicles per day or 20 Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) per day then a scheme-specific range of measures to reduce reliance on cars, reduce trip generation and promote ultra-low emission vehicles may need to be devised and a contribution towards restoration measures may need to be provided in accordance with the Holcroft Moss Habitat Mitigation Plan.	The increase in average annual daily traffic flow (AADT) on the M60 leading to the M62 northeast of the development will be 35 vehicles, therefore further assessment of air quality impact at Holcroft Moss is not required.	