

AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee
19 October 2023

7.1 – Land off Hall Rd, Copford

Cycle Parking

The agents have confirmed that: 'Every plot that doesn't have a garage (private sale and affordable) will be provided with a secure and weatherproof cycle store. Each house has independent access to their rear garden, so bikes won't need to be wheeled through the house to get to the back garden'.

A Further Representation from Copford PC

I feel there are a couple of serious issues here which have not been addressed primarily one of public safety.

Given the known width of the road even with a short 1.5m and longer 1.2m run over footway-on the opposite side-there is no consideration for the safety of pedestrians, mothers with buggies and wheelchair users. It appears to be assumed that traffic will 'give way' to any of these users, but the reality is that this is less likely. The width of run over footpath without vehicles is arguably sufficient, although I understand DDA requires 1.547 m width for a wheelchair user which is not available. There is no provision for cyclists and to suggest so by Highways is incorrect, the developers made much of provision for cyclists in their original documentation, but there is none other than using the shared roadway.

I would strongly suggest that a road safety audit is required to consider what is likely to be a significant risk to public safety.

The secondary concern is of traffic movement along the road, even if there is only vehicle movement then the category of road that matches Hall Road is not met. Neither is it possible for some combinations of vehicles to pass even if the run over footpath is used.

The argument that EDG and Manual for Streets provides 'guidance' only is always put forward as a contra argument. If this is the case what is used to assess suitability of road widths and why in some cases is EDG and the Manual for Streets put fwd by Highways.

In response the applicant's Highway Engineers have stated:

Our understanding in relation to the need for infrastructure to be DDA 1995 (as outlined by the Parish Council) compliant, is now covered by the Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure, 2021, document.

- The Inclusive Mobility document suggests;

Para 3.2 “Someone who does not use a walking aid can walk along a passageway less than 700mm wide, but just using a stick requires greater width than this: a minimum of 750mm.

A person who uses two sticks or crutches, or a walking frame, needs a minimum of 900mm, while a vision impaired person using a long cane, or with an assistance dog, needs 1100mm.

A vision impaired person being guided needs a width of 1200mm.”

On page 23, the data in the document on widths of wheelchairs suggests the 95th percentile for a powered/electric wheelchair (the largest) is 706mm.

An allowance for self-propulsion on a manual wheelchair is 100mm on both sides (where the 95th percentile manual wheelchair width is 702mm), thus the width for the non-electric wheelchair users is 702mm plus 200mm = 902mm, which is less than the 1200mm footway provided.

- Based on the above information the provision provides for the users identified by the Parish Council.
- A Road Safety Audit was completed in March / April 2020 which did incorporate at the time footways at 1.2m width, which is in Appendix E of the Transport Statement.
- It is correct that there is no segregated use for cyclists, however the nature and environment of Hall Road is suitable for on carriageway use for cyclists as set out in document, Cycle Infrastructure - LTN 1/20, Figure 4.1 where roads with traffic speeds of less than 30mph speed and with vehicles flow up to 1000 per day, can have mixed traffic. Traffic data is included in the Transport Statement confirming 12 hour traffic flows at approximately 238, and even if this were increased pro-rata for the 24 hour period, the traffic volume would be less than 1000.

In terms of the width of Hall Road, MfS (Manual for Streets) suggests widths of 4.1m for two cars to pass or a lorry and cyclist. MfS also suggests 4.8m for two cars to pass or a lorry and car. Lastly, in locations where the overrun footpath is used, at 5.5m MfS suggests two lorries can pass or a car and lorry. This confirms that the widths provided are suitable in this location for access to the site along Hall Road.

Further Representations

Five further representations have been received. These can be read in full on the Council's website but objected to the scheme for similar reasons to those as set out in the Committee papers. One was particularly detailed with regards to highway safety and the inadequacies of the access arrangements.

7.2 - Gamet Bearings, Hythe Station Road, Colchester

Amendment for 220317 Gamet Bearings:

As a point of clarification, the application has been called in by Cllr Tim Young.

7.3 – Car Park to North of Napier Road, Colchester

Through further discussions between the applicant and the Council's Archaeological Officer it has been agreed to remove condition 4 (Archaeological) from the approval.