

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

FROM: HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT; PLACE DIRECTORATE

Application No: 20/P/1438/FUL

Development Control Case Officer: Neil Underhay

Location: Adjacent Heathfield Park, Bristol Road, Hewish
Proposal: Proposed Park and Ride
Date: 01/04/2021

Recommendation

Objection/refusal (or grant only subject to inclusion of below revised plans and conditions)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Proposals are contrary to DM24 (Highway Safety)	

Revised Plans and information required

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised junction design to include a right turn lane and lighting Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit (RSA) for proposed junction design Transport Assessment Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure and way of working Details of disabled parking provision in the drop-off and pick-up area Details of staff cycle parking and facilities

Conditions Required (if application to be approved)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction Management Plan Boundary Treatment to ensure vegetation no higher than 600mm in visibility splay Mitigations identified in the Road Safety Audit to be agreed and provided Section 106 contribution for public transport and to support the Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) Pedestrian crossing point to be delivered via Section 278 agreement

Recommendations to Applicant

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early contact with Streetworks team

Formal comments from Highways & Transport Development Management

Summary

Proposal for a 3,101 car space park and ride facility to serve Bristol Airport.

Access

Concerns leading to recommendation of refusal/objection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

The proposed junction design is not suitable for the traffic flows on this highway. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate a safe access, and on that basis we recommend refusal on grounds of DM24 (Highway Safety) of the Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 (2016).

Whilst a safe access junction in accordance with DMRB may be achievable, the impact of the likely measures needed, to include traffic lights, speed reductions, right turn lane, ghost island and crossing point, would impact on the highway network. In addition there are other junctions in close proximity and above average collision statistics on this stretch of highway.

Concentration of vehicle movements

Given that the vehicles exiting the site are likely to be concentrated around bus drop-off times, the assessment of the junction capacity needs further detail. This will be dependent on the frequency of the bus service. This is likely to result in a queue of vehicles waiting to exit the site, and a higher level of impatience whilst waiting for a gap in traffic on the A370.

Transport Assessment

Further information required



Comments:

Trip generation

This application seems to be based on the trip generation data for the application adjacent to M5 Junction 21. The applicant has advised that the proposal will result in 12 & 14 AM peak hour movement in August and November respectively and 50 and 33 PM peak hour movements. This volume of additional trips, in itself, is unlikely to have a significant effect on the local highway network.

The applicant has not provided an assessment of the impact of the junction infrastructure requirements on the highway network. We are therefore unable to assess whether the impact on the highway network in the vicinity of the access would be acceptable.

Sustainable Travel & Road Safety

Further information required



General

It is unclear to what extent the proposal will reduce the number or length of vehicle journeys to the airport.

Given that refusal reason 5 for the Bristol Airport 12 MPPA application is that -the proposed public transport is inadequate and will not reduce reliance on car. Car parking should come after public transport possibilities are exhausted, so that the remaining agreed parking need can be established.

How much car parking is needed for Bristol Airport is therefore unclear as there is no agreed position of what is deliverable from public transport modal share.

When the level of parking provision outstrips passenger growth, this undermines public transport viability. Low cost parking competes with public transport usage and viability of services.

For the reasons above, we consider that the application is premature, ahead of the Bristol Airport 12 MPPA appeal concluding.

Travel Plan Statement

The applicant has concluded that those using the proposed site, will have already decided to travel by car, and therefore the only matters for consideration are for staff travel.

There are limited sustainable travel options for staff to reach the proposed site, with bus travel being the only real alternative to private car. For some hours during the night and for lunch breaks, the only real option will be to drive.

However, improvements are needed to support bus travel. A clear walking route should be provided from the bus stops on the north and south side of the A370 to the site offices and to other locations on site where staff will be working. A pedestrian refuge island should be provided on the A370 to enable bus users to cross. This should be delivered through a Section 278 agreement.

Cycling

As per the parking standard, showering facilities will also be needed. 'Where cycle parking is provided principally for staff, shower and changing facilities should be provided.'

It is not clear how cyclists enter the site, where cycle parking be located and what provision has been made to ensure it is easy for those that do choose to cycle to reach the parking. E.g. there should be an obvious route for cyclists to reach the cycle parking and dropped curbs if necessary.

To understand how many staff cycle parking and car parking spaces will be needed, shift patterns and numbers on site are needed.

A full travel plan with targets, further supportive initiatives and at least biannual monitoring is required. This will need to be **conditioned** and in place prior to building on site.

Electric vehicle charging

In line with the government's Clean Growth Strategy, and pledge to ban the sale of new petrol and diesel cars by 2030, it is essential that a suitable level of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging provision be provided at new development. The National Planning Policy Framework was updated in 2018 to ensure that new developments 'be designed to enable charging of other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations'. On this basis, and in line with the Council's declaration of a Climate Emergency in 2019 and ambition to become Carbon Neutral by 2030, the **Highway Authority would expect the applicant to provide a suitable level of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure.**

For non-residential development, at least 10% of the total parking spaces should be served by a fast (7kw-22kw) charge point, with a minimum of one space. A further 10% of spaces should include passive provision to support the later installation of charge points. Where more than 20 EV bays are to be provided, provision of a rapid charger should be considered from the outset.

All proposed EV charging infrastructure should be shown on a plan as part of the planning application and developers should specify what passive/active provision is to be provided. Please **condition**.

Integrated Transport Unit; Public Transport

Further information required



Comments:

Existing bus/coach services

We have concerns about the impact of the proposed development on existing bus and coach services. At the point where the A370 meets the site, there are currently two services in operation – the X1 from WsM to Bristol and the less frequent X2 WsM to Bristol (via towns and villages). Both services are already heavily over-subscribed at key tourist times and often struggle to cater for all intending passengers.

In the wider area (although not of use to the site in their present routing format) are the longer distance Megabus and Falcon services to London and the South West, the A3 Airport Flyer and the 126 service to Cheddar and Wells. None of these services directly pass the site and would therefore require financial support in order to facilitate a routing change to be able to do so.

Bus operator

As the proposed use for the application is as that of a Park & Ride site, we cannot see any details of the plans to appoint a suitable operator to deliver the bus services.

There are plenty of points where the nature of the services are referred to but no firm plans on the scale of the bus operation, its likely base, procurement windows, etc...

Furthermore, there is reference to '25 seat buses' which will either mean large vehicles down-seated to 25 seats and luggage racking or 25 seat vehicles further down-seated – either way will impact on roads to the Airport as this will significantly increase bus traffic on already constrained roads.

Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS)

At this time no information has been submitted to demonstrate no adverse impact on the Airport Surface Access Strategy delivery of a 15% public transport modal share by 10mppa.

If this application were to be approved, we will require the developer to make a **Section 106 contribution** to support these services and the ASAS more widely. A figure is yet to be calculated, but will be based on the contribution made by the airport to support these services per parking space provided by the airport. This would be pro-rata'd for the proposed development.

Without such contribution to the overall ASAS, there is a risk of over-supply of parking serving the Airport, which in turn may lead to parking price competition, and a detriment of local and strategic public transport support.

Airport parking related appeal decisions

Inspectors cited that actions undermining the Airport's ASAS are considered with significant weight in recent appeal considerations of airport related parking in green belt locations. Whilst the green belt location is not relevant in this case, the potential undermining of the ASAS is. The reference numbers for these are APP/D0121/C/17/31754933175494 &3175495 and can be found by searching at the Planning Inspectorate website under those references at the following web address <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/CaseSearch.aspx>

In a more recent appeal dismissed for refusal of change of use at Birds Farm, Winford 19/P/00479/COU ref. APP/D0121/C/20/3250491 & ...3250492 the Inspector stated in paragraph 31; "Airport parking needs to be provided in accordance with the strategic aims of the Council's policies and not, as here, in an uncoordinated ad hoc manner. I note that the Inspector deciding the 2018 Rocks Lane, Felton appeal (Refs: APP/D0121/C/17/3175493, 3175494 & 3175495) found that following the implementation of the ASAS the proportion of passengers travelling to and from the airport by public transport was significantly higher than the initial trajectory, thus indicating that it was achieving its aim. That Inspector afforded the ASAS and development plan policies significant weight, and I see no reason to differ. The Bristol Airport Monitoring Report 2018 shows that the Bristol Airport commissioned express bus Flyer services had significant increases in patronage over 2017....

Mitigation

The mitigation would likely be a significant financial contribution toward the ASAS to allow it to continue to deliver mode shift and to be based on a percentage share of their parking vs airport provided or total parking quantum - and therefore a related percentage share of ASAS

contribution. We also note that the potential market for the proposed park and ride is wide and therefore the support will need to be to Weston-super-Mare, South West and South Wales services and infrastructure.

Parking Assessment

Further information required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
<u>Cycle</u> Plans do not show the provision of cycle parking for staff. This should be convenient, secure and weatherproof. Further detail is required on the amount, type and location of staff cycle parking.	
<u>Car & motorcycle</u> Plans provided do not detail any provision of disabled spaces in the drop-off and pick-up area. A minimum of 5% of spaces should be suitable for disabled persons. Further detail required.	
No motorcycle spaces are shown. Further detail is required.	

Section 38 & 278

No concerns	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
The works within the highway in association with this development will require the developer to enter into a S278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980). The developer is advised to make early contact with the Highway Authority officer (Mr. W Hole 01934 426707) so that the processing of the order does not impede the implementation of planning consent. The developer will be required to agree to the specification of the works, meet the Council's costs in the drawing up of the order, provide a bond or cash equivalent and meet the Council's inspection charges.	

Construction Management Plan

Please condition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	
Taking into account the local highway network and the volume of material that may need to be brought to site, the Highway Authority would request that a construction management plan is submitted to the Highway Authority for approval prior to the commencement of development on site. This should include but not be limited to, HGV routing, provision for staff car parking, times of site operation, volume of HGV movements throughout the day, highway safety measures such as wheel washing facilities and mitigation measures for any remedial works required. Please condition .	
Licences for scaffolding, hoarding & fencing, mobile elevating work platforms (MEWPs) and builders materials on the highway are required and the applicant should contact the Network Management Team to make arrangements as soon as possible. NSC does not accept roll on roll off skips on the highway. (email; streetworks@n-somerset.gov.uk).	
There is concern regarding the potential implications of the demolition and construction phases of the development and the effect they could have on the surrounding highway network and the environment.	