

Date: 21 August 2024
Application: 242067



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

WBC Highways

Development Management &
Compliance

P.O. Box 157

Shute End, Wokingham

Berkshire, RG40 1BN

Tel: (0118) 974 6000

Minicom No: (0118) 974 6991

Dear WBC Highways,

Outline Planning Approval Consultation

Application Number: 242067

Applicant: The Owner and/or Occupier

Site Address: Land Between Lodge Road And Tape Lane, Hurst, RG10 0EG

Parish: St. Nicholas Hurst

Grid Reference: Easting - 479479, Northing - 173716

Type of Development: Major Dwellings (10+)

Proposal: Outline application for the proposed erection of up to 99 no. dwellings, green infrastructure, open space, pedestrian and cycle links, recreational facilities and other associated infrastructure and access points on Lodge Road and Tape Lane with required improvements. (All matters reserved except for means of access.)

Case Officer: Mark Croucher

Development Management has received the above application and we require your comments on the proposal using the recommended memorandum below. The documents associated with this are available to view in NEC DM using the application number 242067. Alternatively, public documents are available to view on the Council's planning application search page: [Wokingham Borough Council Online Planning](#).

Please index your response into NEC DM against the application. If you are recommending conditions, you should give a reason with reference to relevant policies. A list of standard conditions can be found on the Z Drive at: [Z:\Standard Planning Conditions](#).

Your observations are required in respect of this application within **10 working days** of the above date or **15 working days** if the development type is classed as a major development.

Yours sincerely,
Development Management & Compliance

MEMORANDUM

From:	Gordon Adam Development Control		
Service	WBC Highways	App No:	242067
Address:	Land Between Lodge Road And Tape Lane, Hurst, RG10 0EG.		
Proposal:	Outline application for the proposed erection of up to 99 no. dwellings, green infrastructure, open space, pedestrian and cycle links, recreational facilities and other associated infrastructure and access points on Lodge Road and Tape Lane with required improvements. (All matters reserved except for means of access.)		
Type of Development:	Major Dwellings (10+)		
Site Visit Made:	Yes/No		

Summary Of Recommendations

- ☐ No comment
☐ No objection
☐ No objection subject to conditions (and reasons) **stated below**
☒ Request further information before determination as **stated below**
☐ Objection due to the reason(s) **stated below**

Comments On Proposal

General

1. Highways understands that this outline application is for up to 99 homes east of Lodge Road.
2. This application follows on from a development for 200 homes on the same site that was dismissed at appeal.
3. Highways welcomes the opportunity for providing pre-application comments on the suggested proposed improvements for cycling.
4. This application is supported by a Transport Assessment and framework Travel Plan which is welcome.

Parking

5. The transport assessment states that the proposed level of parking would be too the prevailing WBC standards that are in operation at the time of the reserve matters application.
6. Even though this is an outline planning application, highways would have expected that the borough's parking calculator be used to assess the level of parking based on the illustrative masterplan and illustrative housing mix. This

is required to ensure that there is space within the red line for the assumed level of parking.

7. As part of this submission, a masterplan was submitted (drawing 003-01 Rev B).
8. Garages would need to a minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m or 7m x 3m for cycle storage.
9. All parking spaces would need to be 5m x 2.5m or 6m x 2.5m if parallel spaces.
10. If there are parking courtyards these would need to have at least 6m behind the spaces for safe manoeuvring.
11. The widths of private drives would need to be at least 3.1m
12. Highways would have expected to see a framework car parking management plan submitted.

Cycle Parking

13. There is no mention of cycle parking. These will need to be to Borough standards and be provided either in sheds in rear gardens with direct access or in garages (at least 7m x 3m)

Electric Vehicle Charging

14. There is no mention on the transport assessment of electric vehicle charging.
15. These will need to be provided in line with Building Control Regulations Approved Document S.
16. This has been mentioned in the travel plan but needs to be mentioned in the TA.

Access

17. It is proposed that there would the main access into the site would be from a new priority junction onto Lodge Road. There is also proposed a bus link/emergency access from Tape Lane which would also be available for cyclists and pedestrians.
18. The proposed access on to Lodge Road is acceptable.
19. It is also proposed that the 30mph speed limit would be moved to south of this access which is welcome. A contribution for the traffic order would need to be included in a s106 agreement.
20. In addition, there would be a 2nd pedestrian and cycle access onto Tape Lane a short distance to the north of the proposed bus link/emergency access. Highways questions the need for such a 2nd access.

Traffic Data

21. It is welcome that ATC data was collected in November 2023 over a 7 day period at 4 locations collecting the total number of vehicles per hour in both directions.
22. Whilst average peak hour data has been presented in table 3.4 Highways would have expected to see the flows for each day Monday to Friday. This is required.

23. Highways would have expected the period of collection to have been over a 2-week period to ascertain whether or not there were any obvious trends. However, a 7-day period is acceptable.
24. The data for these sites has been provided and a summary of the average weekday has also been provided which is welcome. However, highways would have expected the survey data to include the AM and PM flows to ensure a quicker assessment.
25. That being said, highways have carried out an assessment of the AM and PM peak traffic for Lodge Road and the range for the AM peak hour (Monday to Friday) is between 209 and 263 per hour. In the southbound direction the range is between 159 and 192 vehicles per hour. This would amount to

Development Traffic Impact

26. It is welcome that the Borough's approved trip rates have been used in this assessment.
27. This resulted in 57 and 51 two-way movements in the AM and PM peak hours respectively.
28. Due to no information on the distribution of traffic, highways have assumed a 50:50 split for traffic access and egressing the site. For the AM peak this would amount to 20 and 8 vehicles exiting and accessing the development in both directions. This would not have an adverse impact on the local and wider highway network.

Strategic Transport Modelling

29. As this proposed development is over the threshold for strategic modelling, highways would have expected that the Borough's strategic modelling would have been used to ascertain the impact of such a development. This was not carried out.
30. That being said, for the previous application for 200 homes that was dismissed at appeal, strategic modelling was used to assess the impact of that development, and it was agreed that there would be no significant impact on the rest of the highway network.
31. As this proposed development is less than half that which was previously proposed, highways is content that the impact would be far less and that there would be no need for strategic modelling to have taken place.
32. The distribution of the development traffic has been assumed from the strategic model which is welcome.

Local Junction Modelling

33. Local junction modelling was carried out for the following junctions, namely
 - Lodge Road/Broadwater Lane
 - Lodge Road/Sawpit Road Junction
 - Site Access/Lodge Road
34. Highways is content with the selection of junctions for modelling.
35. For the Sawpit Road junction, surveyed flows from that planning application have been included which is welcome. However, no base year junction models for this junction nor a plan showing the geometries have been

submitted and are required before a review of this junction model can be assessed.

36. For the Lodge Road/Broadwater Lane junction highways would need to see the base year model, actual turning flows at this junction and a plan showing the geometries of this junction.
37. To assist in the assessment of all the junctions, highways would need to see turning flow diagrams for each junction and for each scenario.

Site Roads

38. It is welcome that the site roads would be designed and built to adoptable standards and be in line with highways design guidance which is welcome.
39. No information has been provided on whether the site roads would be offered for adoption or would remain private.
40. If the site roads are to be adopted, these would need to be delivered through s38 agreement with the Borough. The Borough would also require agreement on inspection fees and commuted sums. The adoption plans, fees and commuted sums would need to be included in the s106 agreement.
41. If the site roads are to remain private, this would also need to be included in the s106 agreement, including details of the management company set up to look after the maintenance of the roads, the Borough's inspection fee and the APC Bond.
42. It is proposed that there would be footways within the site, these would need to be at least 2m in width with dropped kerbs and tactile paving at crossings. The service margins would need to be within pavements and there would need to be limited crossing of the roads with utilities.

Sustainability assessment

43. A sustainability assessment has been undertaken to local services and bus stops which is welcome.
44. The assessment has looked at the walk distances to local services. Clarification is required on whether or not these are actual walk distances from the centre point of the site.
45. It is true such local services such as the primary school, bus stops and the local shop are within an acceptable walk distance. However, no assessment has been made whether or not future residents would use the bus or would use the shop for more than top up shopping.
46. There is a need for more day-to-day activities such as work, secondary schools and weekly shopping that would imply longer journeys more likely made by car.
47. The bus service (128/129) runs between Wokingham, Twyford and Reading calling at the bus stops in School Road. This service runs approximately every 65 mins in both directions Monday to Friday and every 2 hours on a Saturday. There are no late evenings or Sunday services. The application has submitted a bus improvement strategy which has been reviewed and the comments are set out below.
48. In table 6.6, The TA sets out arrival and finishing times for school. Whilst this TA was completed prior to the amendments to the arrival times at the bus stops, this table would need to be updated.

49. According to this table, Holt School finishes at 15:30 and there would be a 400 m walk (5 mins) to the bus stop. Unfortunately based on the revised timetable the bus is programmed to leave this stop at 15:30 and according to the timetable this is the last one at this stop. The next bus is at 16:04 at Sadlers Lane around 2km away which is an unacceptable walk.
50. Based on the location of the site and the lack of local day to day services and even with the proposed improvements, highways is still of the opinion that this is an unsustainable site.
51. That being said, highways have set out comments on the cycle and bus improvements which need to be responded too and reviewed.

Visibility Splays

52. Visibility splays for the proposed new access have been submitted and these are in line with the 85th percentile speed of Lodge Road which is welcome.
53. Any landscaping within the splays would need to be maintained so that it is less than 0.6m high.
54. It is proposed that the 30mph speed limit would be extend beyond the proposed access which would reduce to splays to 43m which is also welcome.
55. Pedestrian and cycling visibility splays need to be provided for the proposed access onto Tape Lane.

Swept Paths

56. Swept paths of a refuse vehicle, single decker bus and fire tender have been submitted.
57. Highways would need to see the swept paths for the bus and the fire tender accessing and egressing the main access.
58. Please note that the dimensions of the fire tender are not those approved by the Borough, the following dimensions would need to be used.



DB32 Fire Appliance	
Overall Length	8.680m
Overall Width	2.180m
Overall Body Height	3.452m
Min Body Ground Clearance	0.337m
Max Track Width	2.121m
Lock to Lock Time	6.00s
Kerb to Kerb Turning Radius	7.910m

59. Even though this is an outline application, highways would need to see swept paths of the above vehicles travelling through the development.

Cycling and Pedestrian

60. A Cycle Improvement Strategy Report (ITB19328-003 TN) has been submitted showing suggested improvements to the route between the site and Twyford which is welcome.
61. The suggested improvements have been based on the Borough's LCWIP proposals which is welcome.
62. Highways questions the flows that have been contained in Table 3.2 as these do not seem to match with the survey data. Highways would need to see the highest peak hour flows rather than the average.
63. In Section B 3rd bullet point states that there will be a new 3m wide shared footway/cycleway, this has not been shown on any drawing.
64. In drawing ITB19328-GA-104 shows a proposal to reduce the speed limit to 20mph on Broadwater Lane to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Highways would seek clarification on why the junction with Tape Lane has not been included.
65. In drawing ITB19328-GA-113 it is proposed to remove the centre line. As this is a bus route, highways would not support this proposal.
66. On Lodge Road across from the Elephant and Castle pub, the pavement ends with a dropped kerb, as there is no pavement on the opposite side there is no proposal for tactile paving. Highways would have expected that there would be a proposal to extend the footway so that a crossing point could be implemented allowing pedestrians to cross over to the opposite pavement.
67. There is a proposal for a bus shelter by Byron Road. Highways is concerned that this could have an impact on visibility splays at this junction and request that visibility splays are assessed and submitted.
68. On the same drawing it proposes a relocation of the lamp column but to where?
69. It also states on this drawing that southbound cyclists rejoin carriageway and south bound advisory cycle lanes, but how are they to do this?
70. It is proposed to relocate the bus stop and layby at the station. Highways would need to see swept paths of a bus accessing and egressing this proposed layby.
71. Where it is proposed that the bus layby is removed, then this would need to be reinstated as pavement and kerb.
72. All design of proposed bus stops would need to be in line with the Borough's Bus Stop strategy.
73. Highways would have expected that the strategy extends into Twyford Town Centre
74. As part of the proposals, dropped kerbs and tactile paving have been proposed at numerous junctions on the route from the site to Twyford Station. Whilst these are welcome, they do lead to long crossing distances in particular at Whistley Green junction. These will need to be looked at and maybe moved to give a shorter crossing distance.
75. There is no mention in the strategy regarding costings.
76. It is proposed to extend the existing pavement on the east side of Lodge Road south to the proposed new access which is welcome.

Safety Audit

- 77. A Road Safety Audit Stage 1 and designer's comments have been submitted which is welcome.
- 78. However, the audit does not cover the proposed accesses into the site and only covers the proposed pedestrian and cycling improvements from the site to Twyford.
- 79. That being said acceptable designer's comments have been provided to the issues raised which is welcome.

Proposed bus Improvements

- 80. A Public Transport Strategy Report has been submitted. This has been reviewed by the Borough's Bus officer who has the following comments.
- 81. The 128/9 timetables have recently been tweaked and this would need to be shown. Table 2.3 would need to show journey time to school so it can be seen how well it aligns with school times.
- 82. In terms of options – WBC appreciate that the developer has spoken with Thames Valley Buses for costing and passenger take-up. The revenue projections are slightly high given the number of concessionary trips and average fares for the fare zone being considered.
- 83. The route proposed in Option 1 is a diversion which means taking other passengers back through the site, so not very direct or convenient. If paired with Option 4 WBC would question the need for Option 1. That being said, how much time does the diversion add to the journey time and what does this do to the reliability and resourcing of the route overall? Also, it would be good to understand how many passengers are being displaced at the Elephant and Castle stops.
- 84. Option 2 of a S106 contribution – This does little to improving the journey times, frequencies, or integration of the service. It is also a short-term funding option.
- 85. Option 3 – Clarification is required on why this option focuses on Piggott School in both options 3 and 4. The site has 6 designated secondary schools. The 128/9 already provides access to Forest, Emmbrook and Holt at school times, why is access to another needed? Is it intended that the route would serve Piggott school other than at school time and what does the bus do at other times if not? A school is not usually a destination for a public bus route unless it is a school time only route or a minor extension to a more substantial route. It looks like half the mileage is to serve Piggott School. Further information is required on the timetabling and rationale of Option 3.
- 86. Option 4 – it is not clear what is meant by "a private bus service", this needs to be clarified. The developer needs to confirm the operational model of this option, is it fixed route or DRT. What type of licence will it operate on? If DRT how does the £174k break down, does it cover all operational costs such as software for example. If this option is fixed route, can a timetable be provided. Comments in Option 3 about Piggott school being the focus would apply here also.
- 87. Generally, it would be questioned why the service charge couldn't be used as a funding mechanism for frequency enhancements to the 128/9, possible over a short section. Is there a way of connecting with Twyford for example

so that more passengers can access Twyford station and help support the longer-term viability of the service?

Framework Travel Plan

88. A framework travel plan has been submitted which is welcome.
89. There is no mention of MyJourney within this document. This is required.
90. The earlier sections appear to be superfluous to the Travel Plan as these are in the TA.
91. Table 3.1 will need to match up with the latest timetable. The last bus from Wokingham is not 14:59.
92. Any comments on the sustainable proposals and bus improvement strategy will be in the appropriate sections on the TA and should not be included in the travel plan.
93. It is welcome that an electric car club space will be provided. This will need to be situated in a location that would be accessible to not only residents in this proposed location but those elsewhere in the village.
94. There is no mention on whether or not this would be paid for by the developer including the appropriate TMO.
95. It is proposed that a sustainable travel voucher scheme would be provided this is welcome.
96. An interim target has been proposed which is welcome. This will be amended once the first annual survey has been carried out.
97. Highways queries the figures in table 6.2 as these seem too high for a 99-house development.
98. It is welcome that a travel plan co-ordinator will be appointed during the sales and marketing process which is welcome.
99. Sufficient resources would need to be available for the travel plan co-ordinator to carry out its duties and deliver the travel plan targets.
100. In table 7.1 the infrastructure measures are not part of a travel plan.
101. Within the Framework for Implementation (Table 8.1) there is no mention of the interim travel plan submission.
102. After 5 years and only once the targets have been met can the travel plan be passed over.
103. There would need to be included further actions that would be required to achieve targets after 5 years.

Framework Construction Method Statement

104. Due to the size and location of this proposed development, highways would have expected a Framework Construction Management Plan to have been submitted. This is required.

Conditions & Reasons (if required)

Date:	12 th Sep 2024	Signed:	Gordon Adam
--------------	---------------------------	----------------	-------------