

## Transport and Highways

<b>To:</b>	Richard Hughes	
<b>From:</b>	Allan Creedy	
<b>Cc:</b>		
<b>Date:</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> July 2022	
<b>Planning Application/Pre-Application Number:</b>	PL/2021/09778	
<b>Site Address:</b> Land at Station Works, Station Road, Tisbury, SP3 6QU		
<p><b>Description of Development:</b>          Outline planning application for redevelopment of the Station Works site to provide a mixed development of up to 86 dwellings, a care home of up to 40 bedspaces with associated medical facilities, new pedestrian and vehicular access and traffic management works, a safeguarded area for any future rail improvements, and areas of public open space. <b>Detailed approval for access is sought at this stage.</b></p>		

Plan	Planning policies key to principle of development
Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS), adopted Jan 2015 (incl. relevant saved policies at App.D)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Core Policy 60 – Sustainable Transport</li> <li>· Core Policy 61 – Transport and New Development</li> <li>· Core Policy 62 – Development Impacts on the Transport Network</li> </ul>
Tisbury/West Tisbury Neighbourhood Development Plan (TNDP), made Nov 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Policy BL.7 – Site Allocation: Station Works</li> </ul>

Main issue(s) for consideration	Comments
<p>The application proposes the redevelopment of the Station Works site in Tisbury to provide up to 86 dwellings, a care home of up to 40 bedspaces with associated medical facilities, new pedestrian and vehicular access and traffic management works, a safeguarded area for any future rail improvements, and areas of public open space. This application is in outline with detailed matters reserved for subsequent determination, save for details relating to means of vehicular access and pedestrian/cycle access.</p>	

As referred to elsewhere, allocation of this site in the neighbourhood plan includes a requirement that the development of the site be led by an agreed masterplan, stating:

***(extract from TNDP)***

*Development proposals should be set down in a Masterplan which has been the subject of consultation with the community and the other interested parties. The Masterplan should indicate the phasing and infrastructure requirements and how their delivery will be assured. Once agreed, development should proceed strictly in accordance with the Masterplan.*

The appropriateness of the inclusion of a requirement for an agreed masterplan was considered by the independent examiner for the TNDP who did not dispute the stated justification for the requirement:

***(extract from TNDP, Examiner's Report)***

*... the Qualifying Body has commented that "masterplans developed in partnership with the local community, LPA and developer are a requirement of Core Policy 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy for strategically important sites and more generally required within the supporting text and although this site does not form a strategic site as part of CP2 it is important to the Tisbury Community and is in effect strategic to Tisbury. The community also want to ensure a good development is delivered. Tisbury wish to follow the example of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and is felt to be a reasonable approach. A masterplan approach does not need to be too onerous; the community simply asks to be part of and consulted on the masterplan development so that this can be agreed with the community prior to any planning application being submitted and thereby reducing or eliminating any objections that may be received if a planning application is submitted 'cold'. This would also enable any discussion to be had with the new owners over why or not they are proposing to include any elements of infrastructure requested and enable discussion with Network Rail."*

Despite the above, I understand from the significant third party concerns expressed as part of the application process that such a Masterplan has not been progressed in a manner which has the support of the local populace.

### **Highway/Transport Considerations**

The Transport Assessment accompanying the application correctly indicates that existing provision for pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the site is very poor.

Network Rail oppose any increase in use of the level crossing at the north of the site, and an existing footway on the opposite side of the proposed access (along Jobbers Lane) is less than 1m in width with no reasonable prospect of improvement and/or integration.

(Network Rail do not accept the applicant's statement that future residents would not have access to the existing Chantry pedestrian level crossing or public footpath at this northern end of the site, believing that any boundary treatment stands the chance of being

breached especially considering that the crossing provides a more direct route to the town for most of the development.)

In order to compensate for an otherwise lack of suitable pedestrian/cycle access, the applicant proposes the closure of the southbound railway arch to vehicular traffic, to be replaced by the installation of a new elevated 3m wide pedestrian/cycle route at a height to coincide with flood thresholds. (I do not propose to comment on the flood levels quoted, but should the EA argue for a higher level, it may well compromise the minimum headroom required for such facilities.)

It would also seem obvious that such a structure would occupy a significant volume within the arch, thereby reducing the space that would otherwise be available for flood storage.

Were such a scheme to progress, it would require advertising and resolving to approve a Traffic Order that would secure closure of the section of the road in question to vehicular traffic – it would also rely on the Highway Authority being prepared to license the provision of such a structure over/on the public highway.

The TA indicates that the surface level of the proposed structure would be built at 91.3m AOD, some 0.6m above existing road level (quoted as 'approximately' 90.63m AOD)

Campbell Reith's drawing numbered 0002 P1 shows the distance between the surface of the proposed elevated structure and the underside of the bridge arch to be **3118**mm. The plated height of the bridge shows the height of the bridge arch above road surface level to be 10'3" (ie **3124**mm) ie virtually the same. It is not possible to reconcile the design drawing with the situation on the ground.

On the basis of those measurements, it is unclear whether such a structure would fit within the arch. The structure and railings would occupy most space within the arch, and would need to accord with DfT's Local Transport Note 1/20 which looks for clear headroom across the whole width of 2.4m. There is insufficient information to demonstrate whether those standards and requirements can be met.

There is also clear photographic evidence to show that there are existing services and drainage facilities within and across the road proposed for covering with the elevated structure, but no indication of the effect of the proposed works or how their provision could be safeguarded.

The nature of the elevated structure is such that any detritus that gathered below the structure would be extremely hard to remove.

The plan accompanying the Transport Assessment proposes that the elevated structure will be built using piling techniques. The TA gives no indication whether Network Rail have been approached to seek their view on whether such a procedure would be acceptable so close to this stone arched structure.

The TA indicates that the structure would be built using open mesh decking. That is not a material that would be accepted for adoption by the Highway Authority.

Closing one of the arches to traffic would result in all vehicles having to use the significantly narrower and lower (currently southbound) single arch. To facilitate such a proposal, the TA indicates the provision of a set of shuttle traffic signals, one set at each end of the closure (at the northern end, pedestrian crossing facilities are indicated). There is insufficient information to demonstrate whether there is sufficient space to accommodate signal poles and other associated infrastructure as well as sufficient road width noting the proximity of stop lines and potential queue lengths.

Alongside, the TA shows plans for significant kerb realignment at both ends of the closure indicating tight non-standard reverse curves, and on a map base that is not accurate to show whether it could be delivered within the red line of the application accurate and/or any other constraints.

In terms of the need for wider connectivity, the TA indicates that the proposed elevated structure would land at a point which would allow access into the town centre via footpaths TISB74 and WTIS14. I am advised however that these paths are also subject to flooding, nor suitable or permitted for cycling.

Even in the unlikely event that all of the above could be resolved, the proposed arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists to access would be lengthy and inconvenient.

Whilst land is shown as safeguarded within the site for the potential railway line dualling and second platform, I understand that Network Rail (and the rail industry in general) has no firm plan in place to undertake these works currently. These works were proposed in the West of England Line Study 2020 (part of NR's modular strategic planning) but the proposals are unfunded and at an early stage of business case development. It is thus unclear whether this safeguarded land would be sufficient for these purposes at this stage.

## **Conclusion**

Given the above, I see no way of being able to recommend a conditional approval.

The basic premise of closing a road open to all traffic and replacing it with an exclusive facility that has been put forward to do no more than improve the planning case for an individual planning proposal is in my view unacceptable.

I do not believe that the Council would be prepared to sponsor or support a corresponding Traffic Regulation Order, nor do I believe the Council would be prepared to enter a license for construction of the elevated structure.

Other proposed works including installation of traffic signals and kerb/road realignment are a) insufficiently detailed to show whether they can be delivered and b) shown to an unacceptable standard.

In detail, (bearing in mind that detailed approval for access is sought at this stage) there remains uncertainty over whether such a structure could be built to a suitable standard within the confines of the arch, or whether the practicalities of construction and ongoing maintenance can be dealt with. (in that context, I am doubtful whether Network Rail would agree to a piled structure, but I accept it is for them to be asked and to respond to.)

Notwithstanding the above, the overall approach to pedestrian/cycle connectivity is contrived, poorly conceived and fails to achieve an acceptable access arrangement for the site. It is noted that previous planning submissions (S/2002/1367 & S/2003/2547) on this site were refused by Salisbury District Council for broadly the same reason. These latest proposals are not considered to have overcome these issues.

In conclusion, I would currently recommend the application be refused for the following reasons:

In terms of several critical aspects, the application does not contain sufficient information to allow proper consideration of the proposals.

Despite the lack of detail, the principles of access for pedestrians and cyclists is unacceptable. The route proposed is unattractive and circuitous, and is conditional on an unacceptable proposition ie the road being closed to vehicular traffic and the implications thereof.

It has not been demonstrated that an acceptable and safe means of access for non-motorised users can be achieved to the site, which is considered to be contrary to Wiltshire Core Policies 60, 61 & 62 and NPPF Section 9, paras 104-106 & 110-112.

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed pedestrian/cycle route meets the requirements set out within LTN 1/20 and DDA 1995 and that the proposed signals can be accommodated within the existing highway. The proposals are thus considered to be contrary to Wiltshire Core Policies 60, 61 & 62 and NPPF Section 9, paras 104-106 & 110-112.