Note clarifying document RBCLP_63

RBCLP_63 is a copy of a clarifying note provided during stage 2 hearings produced by Surrey County Council on transport development planning considerations for the proposed site allocations. The document was produced in April 2018.
Runnymede Site Allocations

Transport Development Planning consideration

Please note this is an initial assessment, and subject to future planning applications, preapplication discussions etc. TDP has not assessed in detail any of the sites, this is an assessed of any initial “deal breakers” that would mean the sites were not accessible at all.

1) Chertsey A – Green Lane – Some concerns about visibility, any access may require retaining structures to comply with guidance. Visibility should be achievable given the site covers sufficient land to allow for this to be secured. Green Lane can get busy and links up to the A320 at the double roundabout junction. A320 corridor study should identify suitable improvements to mitigate this.

2) Chertsey B – Woodside Farm – The existing access has severe restrictions on visibility, however due to the size of the site, it is likely that sufficient visibility could be secured with land on the site in question. The vertical alignment changes of Bittams Lane at this point could be an issue restricting visibility, but this could be tackled through lower speed limits and speed reduction measures. Bittams Lane is narrow and concerns raised by residents re: rat running and narrow carriageway. Consider widening of carriageway and speed reduction measures throughout Bittams Lane. Green Lane junction should be okay, but needs checking through modelling and as per 1) above, the A320 corridor study should provide suitable mitigation.

3) Chertsey C – Bittams lane, east of Chertsey B – Again restricted visibility, but less of a gradient issue here, and once again the site is large enough to provide visibility splays within the land in control. Bittams Lane is narrow and concerns raised by residents re: rat running and narrow carriageway. Consider widening of carriageway and speed reduction measures throughout Bittams Lane. Green Lane junction should be okay, but needs checking through modelling and as per 1) above, the A320 corridor study should provide suitable mitigation.

4) Ottershaw East - Brox Road – New access point is on a relatively straight section of Brox Road, so visibility isn’t an issue here. Junction with A320 is a RTI blackspot so this needs to be considered. Also the Slade Road five way junction can be somewhat confusing – consider looking at both junctions to mitigate any additional problems. The proposed site could accommodate 230 dwellings, this is a considerable number considering Brox Road so appropriate modelling would need to be carried out to ensure that any new junction would be able to manage access.

5) Virginia Water South - Kitsmead Lane/Trumpsgreen Road junction – The provision of a new roundabout and the change in road adoption arrangements at this location would need
sufficient input from the CHA in order to ensure that it met engineering standards. Any
development at this point would need to factor in Longcross and carry out suitable
modelling to determine junction design. However, assuming these could be overcome then
there should not be any access issues.

6) Pyrcroft Road, Chertsey – Carried forward from previous local plan.

7) Wick Road – New access from Wick Road, visibility should be satisfactory, Wick Road is
relatively narrow and the junction with London Road has just been improved to cope with a
recent development. Modelling should suggest whether further improvements are required.
Footway access to the A30 is strongly recommended here.

8) Virginia Water – Merlewood Access – This is on a private road outside of the jurisdiction of
the CHA. However having carried out a site visit it was noted that the proposed access is
bordered by historic brick walls that limit visibility significantly. These could be
removed/resited to improve views, or if this is not possible, there is sufficient space to move
the carriageway to allow for a wider verge to improve visibility.

9) VWN-Kenwole- having looked at the proposed access on Callow Hill, I’m not sure if the
visibility provided on the submitted plan can be achieved. The road gradient at the proposed
location seems to preclude visibility, particularly at the minimum height of 1.05 metres that
we would normally request for visibility splays.
However, if the access is moved farther up Callow Hill (towards Kenwolde Lodge) then
vertical visibility improves a lot and I don’t think horizontal visibility would be excessively
compromised.
So, I don’t think this is going to right off the site, as the site extends along the edge of Callow
Hill in either direction then the land allocation should be okay.

10) Thorpe Lea Road (North) – The proposed access is via two existing accesses, both of which
appear to be functioning satisfactorily. The existing use of the sites would also need to be
considered and as one is currently B1 it may well mean that the proposed development
would result in a reduction in trip rates associated with the site.

11) Lyne Lane west – The specific location of Lyne Lane west proposed access is unknown,
however the frontage of the site appears to follow Lyne Lane, therefore an opportune
location should be available. Lyne Lane is relatively straight, but the vertical alignment varies
so visibility on peaks and troughs can be compromised.

12) Lyne Lane east – This is utilising an existing access to a waste site. This access has been built
to accommodate HGVs and provides sufficient visibility, therefore should be suitable for the
proposed development.
13) Row Town West - Accessed via an existing entry/exit on Row Town, this currently appears satisfactory.

14) CB: Note, I spoke with Tim separately who said access on to Thorpe Lea Road West via New Wickham Lane would be satisfactory in principle to accommodate 200 dwellings worth of movements, subject to modelling.