



Technical Note

Highways Review

Project	Land to the East of Lynsted Lane, Teynham	Job No	1000007836
Subject	Highways Review Response to Stantec Note (dated: 09/05/22)	Issue	03
Prepared by	Rob Franklin	Date	26/05/22
Approved by	Ben Meekings	Date	26/05/22

Introduction

- 1.1 Swale Borough Council (SBC) commissioned Project Centre (PCL) to provide a Technical Note (TN) reviewing highway matters relating to:
- Land To the East of Lynsted Lane, Teynham - Outline application for the erection of up to 10 no. residential dwellings with associated landscaping, road layout and parking.
- 1.2 We (PCL) provided an initial highways review dated 12 April 2022, concluding further information was required before the proposal could be fully supported on highways grounds.
- 1.3 Stantec has provided a response dated 9 May 2022 (TN02), to our points deemed outstanding. This TN therefore outlines our concluding comments and the response provided by Stantec.
- 1.4 By way of summary, we consider the response provided by Stantec to be sufficient to address our initial concerns, noting:
- The scheme is considered compliant with relevant national and local highway policy,
 - Following conversations with Stantec and the evidence presented, the design of the site access is considered suitable,
 - We agree that the 5 compensation parking spaces which can be accommodated within the site should be secured by a planning condition, with the details determined at the reserved matters stage.



PCL Comments and Stantec Response

- 2.2 As per Section 1.7 of the Stantec response, our initial TN listed our commentary in subsections. For ease, these have been replicated and are included below.
- 2.3 Our issued comments are also bulleted below, with a summarised response from Stantec, detailing the key points, provided in italics.

Policy Context

- Demonstrate the suitability of the development in relation to national and local policy, as highlighted throughout this TN.
 - *With regards the remaining narrative, Stantec note the policies listed by Project Centre have been cited in the Stantec Transport Statement (49905/8545). Whilst these policies have detailed sub-elements, it does not seem proportionate for a ten dwelling site proposal to explore any further than just affirming the site has been deemed sustainable in transport terms and that all reasonable efforts have been made to promote sustainable modes (public transport and active travel) and discourage car usage.*
 - *Furthermore, the completion of a Road Safety Audit and agreement of the Highway Authority confirms that there should not be any conflict against policy in terms of safety and traffic capacity. This is outlined in the Policy Response section of the TS 2.9.*
- 2.4 Based on the above, when reviewing the information relating to the development, it was not clear which plans related to the preferred layout on Lynsted Lane, hence further clarification was required.
- 2.5 During the initial response, we had concerns relating to the operation and safety of the access arrangement, which have been addressed and discussed throughout this TN.
- 2.6 In addition, no evidence was submitted in relation to discouraging car use, however, we do acknowledge the proposed footpath extension on Lynsted Lane, which will accommodate trips to the village on foot.



- 2.7 Train and bus connections are not considered 'good' as outlined in the Transport Statement (TS), however, given the size of the development proposal, are not anticipated to put stress on existing services.
- 2.8 Based on the information provided, we have no further comments.
- *This response does not aim to dismiss the policy points listed by Project Centre, but to emphasise that the documents LTP4, Swale Local Plan and KCC Active travel strategy are high level policy documents which acknowledge that some trips will still be car-based, but that efforts towards sustainable modes are important to promote.*
 - *Notwithstanding this high-level response, Stantec would point out that the bus and train accessibility for Teynham, as well as close access to shops and services, and thus the proposal site, has been addressed in the Transport Statement in Section 3. The walk to the train station, and to the bus stops, also contribute to active travel. This was noted within the TS at paragraph 2.4.3.*
- 2.9 We acknowledge that public transport connections to the site have been discussed in Section 3 of the TS, as confirmed in our original response, however, existing bus services are infrequent and may be unattractive for future residents.
- 2.10 Section 3.3 of the TS confirms this, with only one bus (3X Service) being accessible on an hourly basis. Although we agree with Section 2.9.4 of the TS, that the site has bus and train connections, services within the immediate area are lacking, as demonstrated in the submitted TS.
- 2.11 We have seen no evidence in the TS to how the proposed development will support and enhance the existing sustainable transport network opportunities (as mentioned in Section 2.4.4 of the TS), nor encourage multimodal journeys (Table 5-4 of the TS anticipates only walking and vehicle trips during the peak hours).
- 2.12 With that said, we acknowledge that total trip generation from the site is anticipated to be low and as mentioned as part of our initial review, we are satisfied the development is not going to have a material impact on the local network.
-

PROJECT CENTRE

- 2.13 As mentioned, given the size of the development proposal, the anticipated trip generation of public transport users is low and is not expected to put stress on existing services.

Site Access

- Determine the extent of parking restrictions required on Lynsted Lane, so that visibility is not obstructed at the site access. We note this should be included on the revised layout for Lynsted Lane which proposes give way controls on Lynsted Lane.
 - Demonstrate that suitable SSD can be achieved on approach to the Lynsted Lane give way control.
 - *Please see updated drawing 49905/5501/005E which has confirmed visibility splays and SSD. These meet the requirement of Manual for Streets (MfS), Kent Design Guide and also considered DMRB CD109.*
 - *The SSD is shown as 70m, using DMRB for a 30mph/50kph road but this is a robust overapplication, and 43m is sufficient commensurate with the agreed approach with KCC Highways for the site access visibility splays (as per MfS and 30mph). This approach itself is deemed particularly robust because the nature of the road, parked cars and approaching/leaving a junction would result in a speed under the 30mph posted.*
- 2.14 We have reviewed drawing 49905/5501/005E and acknowledge visibility splays in both directions are achievable. We have no further comments.
- The proposed double yellow lining should extend for the full length of the required SSD visibility splay, notably to the south on the eastern side of Lynsted Lane, to ensure visibility splays are not obstructed.
 - *In terms of extending the yellow lining to the south on the eastern side of the road (access visibility splay side), as suggested as the most pertinent, this is clearly not problematic but is also likely unnecessary as parking alongside the hedgerow is unlikely and not witnessed in the parking beat survey. Nonetheless Drawing 49905_5501_004 has been updated to so show this extra 'eastern side' lining. This drawing is appended (49905_5501_004B)*
-

PROJECT CENTRE

- *Stantec would also likely reaffirm that the design approach to the south had been 'corner-protection', and this had been deemed sufficient in previous dealings with KCC Highways and the Road Safety Auditor.*

2.15 We have reviewed drawing 49905_5501_004B and have no further comments.

Refuse Collection and Servicing Tracking

- Update the vehicle tracking assessment, ensuring there is a realistic start location for vehicles when accessing and egressing the proposed site. This should also include swept paths for fire tender vehicles, to ensure the proposed access arrangement is suitable for emergency access.

- *Please see updated drawing 49905/002E, where parked cars have been added for context for the movement of the refuse freighter. The start position is also clearly shown in a 'realistic' position. This drawing addresses the points in Figure 4 and Figure 5 of the Project Centre. Clearly a fire tender is a much smaller vehicle and thus can also access the site. The double yellow lines remain unchanged, on the western side, and a large car is shown parked at the immediate cessation of the markings.*

2.16 We have reviewed drawing 49905/002E and acknowledge the revised tracking.

2.17 Through direct contact with Stantec on 24 May 2022, we have addressed all concerns relating to the vehicle tracking of the site access and have no further comments.

Parking Surveys

- Demonstrate that any loss of parking on Lynsted Lane can be accommodated elsewhere along the road, within a suitable walking distance. Overspill parking within the site boundary, as proposed by the applicant should be secured as part of a planning condition.

- *The final level of compensation parking would be a Reserved Matter and we would therefore suggest that this is dealt with at Reserved Matters stage. However, we have confirmed with the scheme architect, OSG Architecture, that several additional compensation parking spaces can be made readily available on*

PROJECT CENTRE

the site with little change to the current indicative layout (and could easily be accommodated on the western side of the site). It is considered that 5 compensation parking spaces can be accommodated within the site and this can be secured by planning condition and dealt with in detail at reserved matters stage

2.18 We acknowledge the provided parking survey information and consider it acceptable.

2.19 We agree that the 5 compensation parking spaces which can be accommodated within the site should be secured by a planning condition, with the details determined at the reserved matters stage. We have no further comments.

Conclusions

3.1 To summarise:

- We consider the response provided by Stantec to be sufficient to address our initial concerns, as documented in our initial response dated 12 April 2022, noting:
 - The scheme is considered compliant with relevant national and local highway policy,
 - Following conversations with Stantec and the evidence presented, the design of the site access is considered suitable,
 - We agree that the 5 compensation parking spaces which can be accommodated within the site should be secured by a planning condition, with the details determined at the reserved matters stage.