

## Technical Note 01

---

**Project:** Land to the south of Dunlin Walk ref. 18/506328

**Subject:** Comments on Transport and Highways Matters

**Prepared by:** Bruce Bamber

**Date:** 12/11/2020

---

### Introduction

1. Railton TPC Ltd has reviewed the layout of the proposed development of 20 dwellings on land to the south of Dunlin Walk on behalf of Swale Borough Council.
2. The comments set out below are based on a review of the transport supporting information set out in *Technical Note 2: Access Appraisal* (Motion, 14/11/2018) and the various consultee responses and other background information available on the Swale Planning Portal.

### Traffic Impact - General

3. A development of 20 dwellings will generate around 10 vehicle movements in the peak hours. This level of trip generation is unlikely to lead to any significant impact in terms of increasing queues and delays at local junctions. However, in this case, the applicant has negotiated a financial contribution towards the upgrade of the Grovehurst junction. This is a reasonable approach to adopt.

### Transport Sustainability – General

4. The proposed development is located within a reasonably accessible location with a range of facilities, including a primary school within walking distance. An hourly bus service is also available within around 400m of the site.
5. It is concluded that there are no grounds to object to the proposed development for transport sustainability or accessibility reasons.

### Car Parking Numbers

6. The applicant is proposing 56 car parking spaces. Of these, 12 are inaccessible as they are provided in a tandem arrangement and 8 are 'doubly' inaccessible as they are garages located behind two tandem spaces.
7. The relevant parking standards are set out in SBC's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), May 2020. Appendix A of this document sets out recommended

numbers of car parking spaces for dwellings of varying sizes in defined location types. For the purposes of assessment it has been assumed that the ‘suburban’ location is relevant in this case. The following parking levels are recommended:

*Table 1: Car Parking Provision (SBC Parking Standards, May 2020)*

Dwelling Type	Standard	Required provision
2 bedroom house (x4)	1-2	4-8
3 bedroom house (x10)	2-3	20-30
4 bedroom house (x6)	3+	18+
Visitors	0.2	4
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>46-60</b>

8. Given the inaccessibility of the proposed garages, it is considered that these should not be counted towards provision. A total of 48 spaces are therefore proposed. This number slightly exceed the minimum number of spaces recommended by standards. The proposed provision does, however, fall well short of the number required if the higher standard is applied.

9. It is concluded that there is a significant risk that the proposed development will lead to some level of on-street parking. Given that the majority of the access road is required to be free of on-street parking to allow vehicles to manoeuvre into and out of parking spaces, it is possible that the development may lead to some level of displaced parking or parking in inappropriate areas that could give rise to highway safety issues or hinder emergency access routes.

10. It would be possible to overcome the above concerns about parking provision with amendments to the internal layout of the site and a reduction in the density of proposed development.

#### Size of Car Parking Spaces

11. The proposed parallel car parking spaces (visitors) are shown as 5m in length. These need to be extended to 6m. This should be possible without any significant change to the site layout.

#### Electric Charging Points

12. No information is provided regarding electric charging points. However, there does not appear to be any reason why these could not be provided when the site is subject to detailed design.

### Cycle Parking

13. No cycle parking provision is indicated. For the majority of dwellings the only option would be to store bicycles within the house or carry bicycles through the house to reach some storage facility in the back garden. For the other dwellings it appears likely that any bicycle storage area in the back garden or within garages will be largely inaccessible if there are any cars parked within the designated parking spaces adjacent to the properties.

14. No thought has been given to bicycle parking provision. The site layout would need to be radically altered if each dwelling were to be provided with safe, secure and convenient bicycle parking.

### Access to Dwellings

15. The front doors of the 12 smaller dwellings to the west of the site are made inaccessible by the presence of parked cars and landscaping area. Pedestrian routes are required between front doors and the shared surface access road. This will either replace landscaping areas or will require additional area.

### Servicing and Deliveries

16. No turning head is proposed at the eastern end of the site. Any larger delivery or service vehicle will be required to reverse up to 125m to access the eastern end of the site. The Kent Design Guide identifies a maximum reversing distance for service vehicles of 20m and for delivery vehicles, 40m (Designing for Movement, p.144). This is a major concern, particularly given that the access road is envisaged as a shared surface road.

17. The applicant suggests that the eastern part of the site can be serviced from Sanderling Way. Even with this arrangement some bins would need to be dragged around 50m to reach the service vehicle. The maximum drag distance is generally around 25m. On this basis the proposed servicing strategy is poor.

18. Given the inaccessibility of sections of the development between the proposed access and the Sanderling Way connection and the eastern end of the site, it is likely that service vehicles will seek to reverse along the whole of the access road leading to the risk of collisions with pedestrians.

19. The servicing arrangements could be made to meet standards if a turning head were provided towards the eastern end of the site. This would require land currently shown to be occupied by dwellings to be given over to highway. It should be noted that if a turning head were provided, it would be necessary to ensure that the level of car parking meets demand to avoid the turning head being used as a parking area.

## 20. Access Arrangements

21. The proposed access crosses a pedestrian route that serves as an important link between housing to the north and west and the local centre, bus services and the primary school.

22. The proposed arrangement has been subject to a Stage 1 Safety audit. This highlighted potential conflicts between vehicles entering and leaving the site and users of the footpath and potential conflict between entering/leaving vehicles and vehicles using the existing parking spaces either side of the existing road north of the access.

23. The Applicant has suggested a reconfigured access that reduces conflict between vehicles and those using the existing parking spaces.

24. The introduction of a vehicle access across the footpath represents a reduction in pedestrian amenity for pedestrians, including vulnerable highway users accessing the local primary school. At present this section of Dunlin Walk is not crossed by any vehicle accesses and is therefore likely to be perceived as safe and convenient. The new access will introduce a perception of risk and will require, for example, greater supervision of children by parents.

25. In terms of highway safety, vehicles using the new access will be travelling at low speed given and there will be some level of visibility between westbound pedestrians and southbound vehicles (estimated from plans and Manual for Streets visibility standards to be appropriate for vehicles speeds around 10-12mph). On this basis, it is considered that the proposed access arrangements are acceptable in highway safety terms.

## Conclusion

26. The site has an acceptable level of transport sustainability and will not lead to any severe impacts in terms of queues and delays.

27. The access arrangements, although leading to a reduction in amenity for pedestrians using Dunlin Walk to access local facilities, do not present a significant risk to pedestrians.

28. The proposed servicing arrangements are inadequate and could potentially lead to safety concerns if service vehicles seek to reverse down the access road to avoid lengthy bin pulls for dwellings in the centre and in the east of the development.

29. From a transport perspective it appears that the site is over-developed. This has led to an under-provision of car parking and over-reliance of inconvenient tandem parking arrangements, the absence of any potential for acceptable bicycle parking provision, very poor pedestrian access to front doors and dangerous arrangements for service and delivery vehicles. These concerns could be overcome when the site layout is subject to detailed design but it appears likely that the number of dwellings will need to be reduced and the layout itself will be significantly altered from that shown currently.