



ELPM Highway Comments Summary (Comments Added) 18.07.2024

➤ Updated comments in blue	
1. Discrepancies on Plans & Detail - S278 drawings have been updated to take account some of the comments provided and incorporated into layout (BG/CW). Final S278 drawings to be incorporated into layout when agreed and completed (CW). - We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the detailed plans and refine detail with LHA. ➤ S278 drawings have been added and incorporated into the layout.	
2. Swept Path for Refuse Vehicle on Wrong Layout Swept Path drawings already updated and they show turning heads opposite 82/90 & 110/182 need enlarging. Layout updated (CW) and tracking to be further updated when final layout agreed (BG/CW). ➤ These turning heads have been enlarged and tracking has been updated to show this.	
3. S278 Details – Condition 39 – Crossing on Bury Street. - S278 drawing updated to show Puffin crossing (BG/IK) incorporated in to the layout (CW), consultants need to explore possibility / detail of combining emergency access with Puffin crossing. Suggestion of separate footpath & cycleway / emergency access added to layout for discussion (BG/IK) - Approved Parameters plans didn't require an emergency access at this point but would welcome the opportunity to discuss the requirements with LHA. ➤ New updated crossing has been added and the emergency access now consists of a 2m footpath with a 3.5m wide cycle path, allowing for emergency vehicles to enter the site. ➤ Also there has been an alternative drawing created (ACL-001 - ALTERNATIVE CROSSING LOCATION) showing a different location for this crossing which can be discussed.	
4. S278 Details – Condition 39 – Cross Lane. - The retained length of Cross Lane referred to is outside the red edge application area and land title and the details of how it can be dealt will be within the S278. We accept there is a mistake in the proposed stopping up and this and the layout with the parking for 136 to 141 has been be corrected (CW). - We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the detail along the kerb lines to prevent parking (bollards?) with the LHA. There is a TRO already in place. ➤ The parking arrangement has been amended including alteration to the red edge to allow full use of this area to the HA.	
5. S278 Details – Condition 39 – Rectory Lane Restrictions - Physical barriers, not just signage and restrictions in the form of bollards are shown on the S278 drawings but need further detail (BG). There is an issue with the extent of Adoptable Highway and the Land Title. The layout has been amended to provide an improved turning head and better footpath connections (CW). New S278 drawing to be provided with improved details / restrictions (CW). - We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the precise detail of the features with the LHA. ➤ Physical bollards have been inserted into the drawing, as well as an updated turning facility including amended footpath connection.	

6. S278 Details – Condition 39 - Church Street East / Stanford Street - The verge shown is the start of the Grey to Green scheme and will be maintained by the Management Company so we would like to retain this. The tapered kerb alignment is existing but has been slightly corrected (CW). The cycleways shown around plot 33 to 40 provides a more direct overlooked route for cyclists and pedestrians rather than having to traverse the road pattern. There is frontage development over the entire loop. - We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the precise details of the restrictive features, the merits of the cycle links and the LHA's concern over the cycle links. ➤ The cycleway has been amended following the re-design of the junction in this area.	
7. A278 Details – Condition 39 – Brook Street. - Brook Street is currently a pleasant environment that the Local Residents are proud of. The granite setts and parking facilities work well. The residents also claim they were gifted the margin on the south side of Brook Street and have planted this themselves. The intention is to keep the setts and landscaped margin. We have extended the turning head leg (CW) and improved the cycleway connection off the end of Brook Street (CW). - We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the details of the new barriers off the end of Brook Street with the LHA. ➤ This area has been amended to show these improvements. ➤ Also, the existing tree line with the shrubs is to be retained as shown on the drawing.	
8. S278 Details – Condition 39 – Cross Lane / Bury Street Bend. - The layout has been updated to show the latest bend improvement and forward visibility splay (CW). A Safety Audit will be arranged once we have agreed all the relevant detail with the LHA. - The Puffin crossing and emergency access arrangements (if required) may affect the final proposals here and need to be agreed as does the final white lining scheme. ➤ The layout has been amended and designed as per comments above.	
9. S278 Details – Condition 39 – Bury Street Pedestrian Crossing. - S278 drawing has been updated to show a Puffin crossing (BG/IK) and included in the layout (CW). The layout also makes a suggestion for the emergency access. Consultants need to explore the detail for the combined emergency access with Puffin crossing (BG) but a suggestion has been included on the layout. - The approved parameters plan didn't require an emergency access at this point but we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the requirements with LHA. - We would question what is meant / required by the reinstatement of the former access to Cocklestorm Fencing (and other vehicular accesses) – it is presumed this is just new kerb lines etc and would expect this level of detail to be within the S278 Agreement itself rather than a Planning consent(?). ➤ Please refer to point 3 with regards to this.	
10. S278 Details – Condition 39 – Phasing. - A more detailed Phasing Plan is being worked up which will include details of how the Invasive Species, flood plain and remediation will be implemented. Phase 4 will not be accessed via Church Street East / Stamford Street and the current phasing plan has been amended to show the existing Cricket Club in red and Phase 4 and 5 swapped over (CW). - This can be discussed further in a meeting with the LHA and there will be the need for some construction traffic to access via Church Street East. ➤ Updated phasing plan shows existing club in transparent blue with phase 4 & 5 swapped.	
11. Internal Road Layout The proposed layout has been designed in accordance with; the approved brief for the development	

provided by Homes England and Bury MBC; all elements of the Outline planning permission; the multitude of site constraints; feedback from the Places Matter Review Panel and; the known preferred standards of highways design of the LHA, all of which we would welcome the opportunity to discuss and talk through and we where possible and practical we are willing to make changes to accommodate amendments suggested by the LHA.

- For various reasons there was very little time to carry out extensive Pre-App discussions with the LHA, all of which we can explain in a meeting to be arranged.
- We can confirm that the proposed estate roads will be put forward for adoption with the following matters having already been addressed:-
 - a. **The Perimeter S278 Details** have been added to the proposed site layout having first been adjusted (CW) to accommodate the comments detailed in Points 1 to 10 of this note, but we welcome the opportunity to discuss and refine the detail of this with the LHA.
➤ These have been added.
 - b. The planning application has been submitted with a plan showing the **areas proposed for adoption** by the LHA and those proposed to be conveyed to households and those to be maintained by the site wide Management Company – currently the 'grass verges' are to be maintained by the Management Company, but this can be discussed with LHA and amended as necessary.
 - c. The '**grass verges**' shown are our proposed 'Grey to Green' scheme, details of which are included as part of the Application and which include SUDs, Biodiversity planting and ecology features. This is seen by all as an important part of the development proposals and it's essential that a pragmatic view of this is embraced all to ensure it isn't watered down to just 'grass verges' and we would welcome a further discussion with the LHA.
 - d. The **Freeholder of the development** land is Homes England and Morris will be building the development under a Building Lease Agreement with them. We can confirm that all the land within the Reserved Matters Red Edge is all with the Title of the land owned by Homes England. Homes England will therefore be party to any S38 Agreement as Landowner, and we will be a party as Developer in the normal way.
 - e. An extensive **cycling strategy** is shown in some detail within the proposals but we would welcome the opportunity to refine the detail with the LHA.
 - f. All **carriageways have been designed at 5.5m wide and footpaths are designed at 2.0m wide**. All combined footpaths / cycleways have been designed at 3.0m wide but we welcome the opportunity to refine these with the LHA.
 - g. Please see Note 7 regarding **Brook Street**. Clearly there needs to be some compromise between the LHA and existing residents in this area.
 - h. We are aware that different Authorities and indeed the LHA prefer different kinds of **traffic calming** across different developments and indeed within a development itself depending on National Guidance and circumstance. The proposals have been designed with a 20mph design speed where practical and in many areas utilise Urban Design features and built form to provide natural traffic calming. We therefore welcome the opportunity to meet with the LHA and agree a scheme of any further traffic calming features deemed necessary.
 - i. We are confident that the appropriate **junction visibility splays** can be shown to be accommodated on the final proposals once they have been agreed with the LHA. There does however need to be further discussion regarding **forward visibility splays** as there are two schools of thought with these i.e. obstruct to provide natural traffic calming or accommodate within the adopted highway, and we would welcome a discussion with the LHA.
 - j. The parking facilities for plots 136 & 205 are designed so vehicles can only leave them in a forward gear and the vehicle movements are only minimal from these. At a distance of 26m from the junction this is said to be more than safe & adequate by our appointed Highway Consultants.
 - k. The layout has been amended so that plot 239 is now served from the rear parking court (CW).
➤ These have been added.
 - l. The extent of **Church Street East** that is currently being used by residents of Church Street for on-street parking has been retained on the current proposals. This also serves as parking for the Upholstery business there. It's clear that the residents have rear garages for parking which aren't being used. Church Street East is outside the red edge of the planning permission and any works will have to be included within a S278 Agreement. It could be that a car parking facility can be designed within the extent of the adopted part of Church Street East and we would welcome a further discussion with the LHA on this.
 - m. Further clarification is required from LHS regarding the suggested '**side arm turning head serving**

plots 355, 395 to 363’. The **‘footpath crossing’** proposed here is to take the combined footpath / cycleway from the North side and onto Brook Street and onward to the new bridge and it was envisaged that this could be incorporated into a traffic calming feature such as a raised table that can be agreed with the LHA.

- n. As note M.
- o. The proposed layout has been amended so as to incorporate a 2.0m wide footpath to the West side of Cock Clod Street (CW).
- p. Further clarification is required from the LHA regarding the comment that **‘most of the proposed turning heads are not adoptable’**. All of the turning heads have carriageways of 5.5m and 2.0m wide footpaths and have been shown to track the required refuse vehicle. The arm lengths and geometry of some of the turning heads have been designed to work with the proposed buildings and urban design aspects of the development. Some adjustments have been made to the layout to accommodate the latest tracking (see note 2) and to ‘standardise’ elements i.e. plots 17, 98, 970 & 374 (CW).
- q. All **private drives** have been checked and where required have been amended to 5.5m wide (CW) and dimensioned for clarity. Where possible the driveway entrances are centred on turning head arms.
 - Typo error above, previously it was requested to be 4.5m wide but all drives have are now 5m wide.
- r. See Note 6 regarding **cycle route around plots 29 to 32**.
- s. The proposed layout has been amended to separate the **driveway of plots 58 (CW)**.
- t. The proposed layout has been amended so as to remove the **stub arrangement serving plots 98 to 103 (CW)**.
 - Junction added in this area.
- u. See note i. regarding **forward visibility splays** around plots 33 to 40.
- v. We would welcome a further discussion with the LHA regarding **the nose in parking arrangement for plots 33 to 40** coupled with the discussion to be had for Note i. on forward viability splays.
- w. Further clarification is required from the LHA regarding the comment about a **‘verge build out being removed and priority markings added’** as there is a plot number reference missing from the notes provided by the LHA.
- x. Further clarification is required from the LHA regarding the comment regarding the **access arrangement for plot 166 to 169**.
- y. Further clarification is required from the LHA regarding the comment that the **footpath link opposite plots 252 to 255** won’t be eligible for adoption.

12. Other issues

- A. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the LHA the preferred form **safety arrangements for cyclists** were they emerge onto the highway.
- B. See Note 1.
- C. The **scoot mova** has been discussed with TFGM as it is agreed with them that they will undertake the work with Morris will fund this and this has been reflected in the submitted position statement and quotes from TFGM.
- D. The Technical Note submitted for Condition 41 regarding the **Parking Strategy** was compiled following discussions with Bury MBC and Homes England. It is understood that the parking condition was imposed on the planning permission prior to the installation of the new Metrolink parking facilities which were installed to overcome problems with street parking by people using the Metrolink. It has been confirmed that the parking restrictions / strategy that was envisaged by the condition is no longer required.
- E. **The footpath & road closure** drawing has been updated to accommodate the comments at Note 4 and we have responded to comments from the councils footpath officer David Chadwick, with particular regard to footpath 9sm which is to be extinguished, as this was no more than a short minor link in the middle of the site which staggered its way around some of the former mill features and which is long since indistinguishable on site no longer walkable as it is completely become overgrown.
- F. The **tracking for the Refuse Strategy** has been updated – see note 2.