SECTION 1  Response to RBCLP_63

1.1  This note is written on behalf of Taylor Wimpey who are promoting Site A of the Chertsey Bittams allocation for residential development. The note responds to the publication by Runnymede Borough Council of RBCLP_63 on 5 December 2019. RBCLP_63 presents a summary of Surrey County Council (SCC) Transport Development Planning team’s considerations of the proposed allocation sites. The document was dated 27 November 2019 but was produced in April 2018. RBCLP_63 is intended to provide:

“... 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.”

1.2  In relation to Chertsey Bittams A, the SCC TDP commentary notes that:

“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.”

1.3  In the intervening time since this initial commentary was presented, formal Pre-application discussions have occurred with SCC including through the submission of technical information and a site visit / meeting in late 2018 / early 2019 (SCC’s response note provided as Appendix A) and most latterly through a further meeting in October 2019 (an agreed Meeting Note is presented in Appendix B).

1.4  The January 2019 SCC response states in relation to access that:

- A single vehicular access is “in line with Surrey Technical Appendix Guidance”;
- Achievable visibility splays are “satisfactory from a Highway safety perspective”;

and
1.5 On that basis, any concerns with visibility at the proposed site access or the deliverability of the access have been adequately addressed and SCC has confirmed that adequate access can be achieved.

1.6 SCC also confirm that in sustainability terms the site can be made to be acceptable:

“There are also opportunities to improve the sustainable transport credentials of the site to make the proposal acceptable. In principle the site is not in a poor location, and the CHA would support such a development.”

1.7 In relation to the wider comments about impacts on the A320, these were discussed with SCC throughout this period of engagement. The A320 Study identifies an improvement for the Green Lane / A320 / Holloway Hill junction and further representations made to SCC have outlined both an ‘alternative’ and ‘interim’ solution to the junction which are now being considered by SCC as part of its forward programme for the A320 corridor. The most recent engagement in relation to the deliverability of the site (Appendix B) confirms that SCC agree:

2.1 …. the overall impact of development on this junction is small, representing an increase in delay on Holloway Hill of 8 seconds. This is less than the ‘severe’ NPPF threshold.

4.3 …. on the basis that Taylor Wimpey is prepared to pay its share of the A320 costs through a financial contribution which will help delivery the scheme, in terms of determining a planning application, SCC would not seek to object to or delay the site coming forward until the full A320 corridor works were in place.

4.4 …. SCC would adopt the same approach that it has at the Hanworth Lane and St Peter’s Hospital sites whereby it secures the payment of contributions to the longer term strategy but does not consider it necessary to restrict the delivery of the development until the works are constructed. It is accepted that there may be some minor and short term detriment to the network, but that this is acceptable.

4.6 …. in principle SCC had no objection to an application coming forward in the short term for the site and considered that in transport terms it could be dealt with through Development Management processes, with a package of mitigation secured by S106 mechanisms for the site. TD confirmed SCC would have no objection on the basis of prematurity of the site in the context of the A320 works.

1.8 The above and attached presents the latest position of SCC TDP rather than the initial commentary supplied by RBCLP_63 dating back to early 2018. There are and remain no transport reasons that the site cannot be delivered at an early stage of the plan process.
APPENDIX A.   SCC PRE-PLANNING ADVICE – JANUARY 2019
Introduction
The following advice is offered following a request for pre-planning application advice, a subsequent site visit and meetings between the Applicant and Runnymede Borough Council. The advice is offered without prejudice to any future planning application submitted and / or any advice or recommendations provided by the Local Planning Authority.

Proposed Development
The proposed development comprises of dwellings and 5 travellers pitches. The site is located approximately 1 mile south of Chertsey town centre and 1.5 miles west of central Addlestone.

Access Arrangements
Pedestrian access to the site is currently via footpaths FP 37 and FP 36. Footpath access is available to the north western and south western boundaries of the site. There is footpath access to Chertsey via Hanworth Lane that crosses underneath the M25 to the north of the site. The site has a substandard vehicular access from Green Lane - a “C” Class road (C127) with a 30 mph speed limit.

Cycle access to the site could be achieved via the existing highway network, and from cycle connections in the immediate vicinity of the site, including off carriageway shared and segregated routes via Guildford Road (A320). However, direct access into the site would not be achievable without an upgrade and redesignation of the footpaths to bridleways or shared cycle/footpaths. In addition, it is noted that many of the footpaths are unsurfaced and not suitable for most bicycle users.

Guildford Road offers bus services to local destinations, however the services offered are not considered of sufficient quality to discourage car use. There are railway stations at both Chertsey and Addlestone that could offer alternative transport choices. However, the stations would require users to travel in excess of the minimum recommended distances. Therefore they may not be particularly attractive options for future occupiers considering the relatively low level of services offered at present.

In view of the above, I consider the site to be relatively unsustainable. It is likely that the predominant mode of transport for future occupiers will be private motor vehicle. However, there is the potential to improve the sustainable transport modes.

Proposed Access Arrangements
The proposal includes provision of a new access from Green Lane to the site. This access can provide visibility splays of 120 metres Y- distance from an X-distance of 2.4 metres (with a 0.5 metre
off set in the leading direction, and a 1 metre off set in the trailing direction). This is satisfactory from a Highway safety perspective. The access road will be provided with a 5.5 metre carriageway and footway/ cycleway of 3 metres on either side of the carriageway. An informal crossing on either side of the new junction is proposed to enable access to the cycle lane and footway on the opposite side of Green Lane. Depending on the expected pedestrian/cyclist traffic, this may require an upgrade to a signalised Toucan crossing. The Developer is advised to investigate this further.

The access road will need to be constructed with a gradient as the site is lower than Green lane at the proposed access point. It is not known whether any retaining structures would be required at this point, but if so they would need to be sufficient to support the carriageway. The structures would be expected to be adopted by the County Highway Authority.

The drawings submitted indicate that a culvert would need to be installed. However, it is unclear whether this is currently taking highway drainage so further investigation of this would be required. In any event it is highly likely that the Developer would need to enter into a S278 agreement in order to carry out these highway works.

The provision of a single vehicular access point for the site is in line with Surrey Technical Appendix guidance which states that up to 300 dwellings can be served from a single point of access.

The Site Transport Appraisal includes modelling results from the Junctions 9 modelling software industry standard and are acceptable from Surrey County Council’s perspective. The results indicate that the proposed access would function within capacity.

In order to improve pedestrian accessibility to the site, the Developer should consider the existing footpaths and investigate the potential for upgrading these to include bound surfaces and the option for cycle use to improve accessibility. Particular attention should be paid to the links to Guildford Road and Hanworth Lane, as the proposed access already caters for cyclists.

**Trip Generation and impact**

Trip generation and modelling has been started and information provided within the Site Transport Appraisal, it is based on data from the TRICS database, again this is acceptable from Surrey County Council’s perspective. The trip generation figures suggest approximately 80 additional trips (two way) during am and pm peaks. While the Appraisal states this is consider low impact, this is dependent on the existing levels of traffic on the local highway network. Even relatively low additional traffic levels can result in a significant impact in areas of high congestion and it is known that a congestion blackspot exists with the junction between Green lane and Guildford Road. In addition, the access is located on a key through route between Addlestone and Chertsey for a range of highway users including pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle users. Therefore the presence of the additional vulnerable road users needs to be considered.

Traffic assignment information has been based on that currently measured on Green Lane suggesting an almost 50/50 split. In terms of local traffic this may be accurate, however, for a development of this size the presence of the M25 and a significant settlement such as Woking nearby is likely to have an influence on this split. Typically I would expect more traffic to be drawn to these locations compared to Addlestone - therefore further work should be carried out on the assignment of trips generated as a result of the proposal.
Any changes to assignment is likely to result in an impact on the A320 and I note that the predicted impact is considered to be 2.1%. While this may be considered relatively small for normal traffic flow purposes, on existing congestion blackspots a relatively small change can have significant impacts - this will need to be accounted for.

**Car Parking Considerations**

The proposed parking arrangements on site should be in accordance with the design principles of Manual for Streets (MfS). With regard to the level of parking provision, Runnymede Borough Council’s parking standards can be accessed via the following link:


**Mitigation - infrastructure**

As already stated, the location of the site is not considered to be particularly sustainable in terms of public transport provision. Bus services are relatively infrequent with a maximum provision of 1-2 per hour during weekdays and an hourly service at weekends, bus infrastructure such as shelters, RTPI (Real Time Passenger Information), and appropriate engineering should be considered to encourage this mode of transport.

There are pedestrian and cycle links within the local area but these are in poorly surfaced places and are not accessible for all. Joining these links should be considered - particular consideration should be given to cycle links and upgrading of pedestrian/Toucan crossings.

The major mitigation considered within the Appraisal is that of the Green Lane/Guildford Road/Holloway Hill double roundabout. The Appraisal has rejected the mitigation provided within the A320 Corridor Study in favour of a smaller scale scheme that would generate improved benefits over that offered within the study. I will be forwarding the details of this on to our modelling team at a later date for full appraisal on the understanding that all the information is correct and the modelling auditing is satisfactory. I would have no concerns about pursuing this option over that within the A320 Study.

Having reviewed the design myself, I note that there is limited infrastructure to allow pedestrians and cyclists to navigate this double junction. Considering the presence of the Salesian School, St Peters Hospital, and the cycle lane links, these vulnerable road users should be considered as part of any redesign of the junction.

**Mitigation – Travel Plan**

A Travel Plan (TP) is required for sites of this size and this should include measures to promote sustainable transport options and link into the improvements highlighted above. Details of the requirements of the TP can be found in the Surrey County Council Good Practice guide for development related travel plans:


Typically a draft is submitted by the Applicant on submission of the planning application. However, given this is at preapplication stage, I am happy to consider a draft at this stage if requested to.
Mitigation – Electric vehicles and car clubs

Please note the EV (Electric Vehicle) charging guidance within the updated Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance:


In addition, the use of Car Club vehicles across Surrey is supported by Surrey CC via the preferred provider Enterprise Car Club. Sites of this size and use are potentially very good locations for car club vehicles to be installed offering opportunities for significant reductions in car ownership levels. Research suggests a single car club vehicle could replace up to 12 privately owned vehicles!

Summary

Based on the information about the development currently available to me, I think that there are several opportunities to mitigate its impact on the local highway network. There are also opportunities to improve the sustainable transport credentials of the site to make the proposal acceptable. In principle the site is not in a poor location, and the CHA would support such a development.

The proposed improvements will require Road Safety Auditing and a S278 agreement in order to carry out the works. It is likely that I would seek to secure the highway works through a planning conditions. For larger scale works that would require the input from several other developments I would be looking for contributions via a S106 agreement.

If you would like to discuss any of the contents of this report further or feel there is something I have not covered, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Tim Dukes

Transport Development Planning
Surrey County Council
APPENDIX B.   SCC MEETING NOTE – OCTOBER 2019
Notes of Meeting

Project No: ITB12183
Project Title: Green Lane, Chertsey
Date: 11 October 2019
Venue: SCC Offices - Quadrant Court, Woking

Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Dukes</td>
<td>Surrey CC (TD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Wall</td>
<td>i-Transport (TW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Coles</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey (GC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Newton</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey (JN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca Martins</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey (LM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Murray-Cox</td>
<td>Turley (DMC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.0 Meeting Context

1.1 TW outlined purpose of meeting:
- To review the i-Transport LLP Technical Note presented (ITB12183-007) which addressed earlier SCC comments in relation to:
  - Impacts of development on Junction 6 (current arrangement);
  - The design elements of the Alternative junction approach; and
  - Modelling comments on the Interim and Alternative arrangements.
- To consider the channels for delivering the site, from a transport perspective.

2.0 Impacts of Development on Existing Junction

2.1 TW summarised the findings of the latest assessment which identified that:
- The existing junction of A320 / Green Lane operates within capacity, and would continue to do so with the inclusion of development traffic from Green Lane; and
- The existing junction of A320 / Holloway Hill exhibits capacity issues on the Holloway Hill approach, with long projected queuing. This is marginally worsened by the proposed development (tested in 25 dwelling increments), but the overall impact of development on this junction is small, representing an increase in delay on Holloway Hill of 8 seconds. This is less than the ‘severe’ NPPF threshold.

2.2 TD noted that there were locally held concerns that on some days the operation of the junction is worse than that projected by the modelling. Further investigation of existing conditions would be needed at the application stage to confirm the i-Transport conclusions. Any application would need to assess the short-term impacts on the existing junction prior to mitigation. This would need to be presented in the TA.
### 3.0 Interim and Alternative Improvements to Junction 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>TW explained that the SCC comments in relation to the Interim and Alternative improvements to Junction 6 had been addressed. TD noted that there were further detailed comments which would be forward for consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>TD noted that a PUFFIN crossing was now proposed outside Salesian College to provide access to the proposed playing fields west of the A320 along with parking restrictions to better manage school drop-off. TD to provide plans which would need to be considered in any future modelling. TW noted that the primary demand for the crossing (i.e. to access the playing fields) would occur outside of network peak hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>TD confirmed that SCC’s preference was not to pursue an Interim scheme associated with the Green Lane development, but instead to secure (proportionate) funding from the site to assist the delivery of the full and final improvement to the junction. This would be the scheme that results from the A320 study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>TW considered that the potential improvement for Junction 6 would be developed by design consultants and would not necessarily be that proposed in the original study and may be more likely to reflect the alternative improvement presented by i-Transport. TD to pass on the alternative improvement for consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Approach to Delivery of the Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>TW explained that the RBC LP promotes a tariff based contribution requirement for each site to mitigate the impact on the A320. In relation to the Green Lane site (Chertsey Bittams Site A), this is derived by considering the most relevant infrastructure improvements, being Junction 6, Junction 8 (St Peters Hospital) and Link 2 (connecting Holloway Hill and St Peters Way). The approach proposes a contribution of some £720k using the earlier costs of the A320 study. TW and GC/JN confirmed that Taylor Wimpey is in no way seeking to avoid paying its share of the necessary mitigation and was committed to paying an appropriate contribution to the A320 improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>TW and DMC explained that the latest RBC LP submissions seek to delay delivery of the site until 2024, timed to comply with when it considers the A320 improvements will be completed. Taylor Wimpey are concerned that this unnecessarily delays delivery of an otherwise suitable and unconstrained site and will be making reps to the LP EIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>TD explained that on the basis that Taylor Wimpey is prepared to pay its share of the A320 costs through a financial contribution which will help delivery the scheme, in terms of determining a planning application, SCC would not seek to object to or delay the site coming forward until the full A320 corridor works were in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>TD confirmed that SCC would adopt the same approach that it has at the Hamworth Lane and St Peter’s Hospital sites whereby it secures the payment of contributions to the longer term strategy, but does not consider it necessary to restrict the delivery of the development until the works are constructed. It is accepted that there may be some minor and short term detriment to the network, but that this is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **4.5** | In the context of the A320 and this site, it was discussed that:  
- The A320 Study is predicated on a scenario which considers operation in 2036 with all development included on the network. It does not consider the phasing of works or development or test dependencies;  
- The impacts of the site on the A320 are in real terms small, around a 2% increase in traffic on the network, and the site is too small in scale to directly deliver any part of the wider A320 strategy;  
- The HIF Bid estimates delivery of Phase 1 (the section relevant to the site) in 2023 and Phase 2 (south of St Peters Way) by 2024. These are short-term delivery timescales and would in all reality mean that the improvements to the A320 are delivered whilst the development is being delivered even assuming an early application and delivery of the site; and  
- In practice the impact of the development coming forward early (i.e. in the next few years) would be that there would be some limited harm on the network in advance of the A320 improvements being delivered. However, this harm would likely be small in scale (as per i-T study), limited in timescale and less than projected on the basis that the remainder of the LP allocations will not deliver in that period (i.e. Longcross is a long term project and many other sites have not progressed at this time). |

**4.6** On this basis, TD confirmed that in principle SCC had no objection to an application coming forward in the short term for the site and considered that in transport terms it could be dealt with through Development Management processes, with a package of mitigation secured by S106 mechanisms for the site. TD confirmed SCC would have no objection on the basis of prematurity of the site in the context of the A320 works.

**Author**  
Tim Wall
Hello Tim

Thank you for this, I think it does reflect our discussions fairly. As always I should probably have included the caveat regarding preapplication discussions - The following advice is offered following a request for pre-planning application advice. The advice is offered without prejudice to any future planning application submitted and any advice or recommendations provided by the Local Planning Authority.

However, I am optimistic that the site in transport terms is deliverable and, subject to pragmatic mitigation, should not be unduly held up by the delivery of the infrastructure included within the A320 Corridor Study.

Hopefully you received my previous email with the plans for the Salesian School crossing and the latest comments on the alternative design and the associated modelling.

While I am writing, I have been searching for the source of the Development Related Tariffs you mentioned during our meeting, I haven’t been able to find these on the Runnymede BC website, would you be able to send of an electronic copy of that document?

Many thanks and kind regards

Tim

Tim Dukes
Transport Development Planning

Surrey County Council
Room 365, County Hall
Penryhn Road
Kingston upon Thames
KT1 2DW

www.surreycc.gov.uk/tdp

tel: 01483 517583
mob: 07968 832708
Morning Tim,

Please see a short note of our meeting on Friday. I have hopefully reflected our discussion fairly, but please let me know if you want any changes made.

Kind regards

Tim

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This email and any attachments with it are intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege.

If you have received this email in error please notify the sender or postmaster@surreycc.gov.uk

The content may be personal or contain personal opinions and cannot be taken as an expression of the County Council's position.

Surrey County Council reserves the right to monitor all incoming and outgoing mail. Whilst every care has been taken to check this e-mail for viruses, it is your responsibility to carry out any checks upon receipt.

Visit the Surrey County Council website -
http://www.surreycc.gov.uk
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