



City Transport

Transport Development Management

Application Response

To: Richard Sewell, Major Applications Planning Team

From: Matthew Cockburn, Transport Development Management

Date: 14 October 2022

Address: Land At Broom Hill/Brislington Meadows Broomhill Road Bristol BS4 4UD

Application No: 22/01878/P

Proposal: Application for Outline Planning Permission with some matters reserved - Development of up to 260 new residential dwellings (Class C3 use) together with pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access, cycle and car parking, public open space and associated infrastructure. Approval sought for access with all other matters reserved. (Major)

Response: Second Response

Recommendation: Technical refusal as s106 and conditions are not yet fully resolved

We are aware that this application will now be considered by a Planning Inspector due to its non-determination within the required timescale.

Following our previous note on 12 July 2022 setting out areas which required further investigation we met the developer's transport and planning consultants on 25 July to discuss how these concerns could be resolved. This was followed up by an email dated 8 August which included a Technical Note (August 2022 Version 4.0) responding to our concerns and providing further mitigation.

Running through the key issues, set out in our previous note, and how they could be resolved:

We consider that the Design Code should be conditioned so that future development is of a high quality.

We are satisfied with the proposed accesses (which are not reserved matters) and these should be secured by condition as detailed below.

We would require that the highway works are accompanied by a Road Safety Audit (which is standard procedure). We would flag that the Road Safety Audits should take place in term time and include periods before and after school to ensure that the movements of children through the area are fully taken in to account.

Many design matters cannot be resolved until the Reserved Matters stage. We are not sure to what extent, if at all, it is appropriate to set out the design matters that will need to be considered at Reserved Matters stage by condition.

We have asked that the Contours and Retaining Walls Plan is shown as “indicative only” as we have not accepted the proposed retaining wall and contour strategy but we are well aware that there will need to be a trade-off between construction and maintenance costs of large structures, as well as their impact on the liveability of the scheme, and making streets as accessible as possible . This will be a matter to resolved fully at Reserved Matters.

A Strategy to upgrade the PROWs through and adjacent to the site should be agreed and then implemented. This should be secured by condition.

On wider mitigation we have reached a point where, if the following can be secured, we would be satisfied that the impact of the development would be acceptable:

Conditions

Access Highway Works

We suggest a Highway Works condition referring to delivering :

- Primary Access on Broomhill Road - as shown in principle in Drawing “Proposed Access” number 1066-007 Rev D
- Emergency Access on Bonville Road as shown in principle of in Drawing “Proposed Site Access” Number 1066-014

Traffic Calming Highway Works

We suggest a Highway Works condition referring to:

- Works to Bonville Rd and Emery Road as shown in principle on Drawing “Proposed Improvements to Pedestrian Route to the East” (Sheets 1 to 7) 1066-020-01 Rev A to 1066-020-07 Rev A
- Access to Allison Road as shown in principle on Drawing “Proposed Route Through Broomhill Junior School” 1066-003 Rev H
- School Road Access and Crossing as shown in principle on Drawing “School Road Access and Crossing “ Number 1066-016.
- Broomhill Road Traffic Calming as shown in principle on Drawings “Proposed Traffic Calming On Broomhill Road (Sheets 1 to 9) Numbers 1066-015 - 01 to 09.

Securing the upgrading of pedestrian and walking links through the site

A proposal for the upgrade of the walking and cycling links through the site must be submitted to BCC and agreed and then delivered prior to first occupation.

Other conditions which should be secured at Outline rather than as part of the Reserved Matters:

- Construction Management Plan
- Phasing Plan, possibly to include the bringing in to use of the Emergency Access after occupation of the 150th dwelling
- Standard PROW condition protecting existing routes unless otherwise agreed and seeking upgrades and diversions as agreed with the PROW team
- Design Code to be adhered to

Mitigation secured via s106

The following items, which we understand the developer has agreed to, would need to be secured via s106:

Public Transport

A contribution of £143,208 towards new and upgraded public transport facilities in the vicinity of the site to include the provision of Real-Time Information displays, raised kerbs and, for 2 locations, new shelters.

Traffic Regulation Orders

A contribution of £25,240 (4 x 6,310) for four Traffic Regulation Orders:

- New pedestrian crossing on School Road
- New road humps -School Road (crossing site) & Bonville road (emergency access site)
- Area wide waiting restrictions – new “adopted” development roads and roads surrounding the development site
- 20mph on new adopted roads within development site

Travel Plan

A contribution of £220 per dwelling for BCC to act as Travel Plan Coordinator for the site and implement appropriate Travel Plan measures and monitor performance of the Travel Plan.

So, to conclude, whilst we would wish for our position to be protected through a Reason for Refusal that adequate mitigation of the transport impact had not been secured when the appeal was triggered we would expect that if the applicant accepts the conditions and s106 Heads of Terms set out above we would be able to withdraw our objection.