



Transport Assessment

**Proposed Residential Development
and Commercial Development.
Battlefield Road, Shrewsbury**

OCTOBER 2020

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	2
2	Existing Conditions	3
3	A F Macdonald Transport Assessment	4
4	National and Local Transport Policies	7
5	Proposed Development	19
6	Accessibility	20
7	Traffic Impact & Junction Capacity Analysis	22
8	Summary and Conclusions	26

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Junction Design Southern Access
Appendix B	TRICS Data
Appendix C	Junction Analysis Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close



© Savoy Consulting Ltd 2020. All Rights Reserved. This report contains confidential information intended solely for the recipient. No part of the report may be copied, reproduced or stored electronically without prior written consent from Savoy Consulting Ltd. This report has been prepared in accordance with the commissioning brief and it is for the client's exclusive use unless otherwise agreed in writing. Savoy Consulting Ltd does not accept liability for any use of this report, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. Third parties should not use or rely on the contents of this report without prior written permission from Savoy Consulting Ltd.

1 Introduction

Savoy Consulting, a specialist transport planning consultancy, has been instructed by their client, Jessup, to prepare a single Transport Assessment (TA) to accompany two planning applications. The first is for a residential development comprising 130 new houses and the second for a commercial development, both located on Battlefield Road, Shrewsbury.

Access to the residential element will be from the existing Mayfield Close junction on Battlefield Road and access to the commercial element will be from a new junction on Battlefield Road at the southern end of the site. This will form a staggered junction with Shillingston Drive.

The local highway authority is Shropshire Council (SC).

The TA has been prepared based on the advice set out in the Department for Transport, Communities and Local Government publication "Guidance on Transport Assessment published in March 2007.

This TA examines the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network and examines the operation of the local highway network. As part of the TA the road safety record of the local highway network is also examined.

The TA also considers the sustainability and accessibility of the site including the availability of existing public transport and accessibility to local amenities within acceptable travel distances by various transport modes.

Following this Introduction, the report is structured as follows:

- ❖ Chapter 2 discusses existing conditions and analyses the most up-to-date personal injury collision (PIC) data.
- ❖ Chapter 3 reviews a recently completed and approved transport assessment for the residential development, prepared by A F Macdonald and approved by Shropshire Council in 2019.
- ❖ Chapter 4 considers and reviews relevant national and local transport planning policies.
- ❖ Chapter 5 considers the proposed development and proposed means of access to the site.
- ❖ Chapter 6 assesses the existing facilities in the immediate vicinity of the site and existing public transport provision.
- ❖ Chapter 7 examines the likely traffic impact of the proposed development.
- ❖ Chapter 8 summarises the work undertaken to prepare the TA and presents conclusions.

2 Existing Conditions

Battlefield Road is a principal road classified as the A5112, linking Shrewsbury town centre to the A49 and A53, both primary routes, to the north of the application site. In the vicinity of Mayfield Close the carriageway width is 7.3 metres with hatched marking in the centre of the road. There are also two 2 metre wide footways either side of the road.

Battlefield Road benefits from a system of street lighting and is subject to a 30mph speed limit, which commences just south of the A49 roundabout 100 metres north of Mayfield Close. The existing Mayfield Close is currently a small cul-de-sac serving 35 houses.

In 2015 the weekday peak hours were determined to be 0745-0845 and 1645-1745 with an average two-way flow of 1050 vehicles in the morning peak and a two-way flow of 1329 vehicles in the evening peak.

Personal Collision Data

Paragraph 4.23 of the DfT document entitled "Guidance on Transport Assessment" (2007) indicates that the transport statement should *"identify any significant highway safety issues and provide an analysis of the recent accident history of the study area"*.

Details of the PICs that have occurred on the local highway network in the vicinity of the proposed development have been analysed using data from CrashMap. CrashMap uses data collected by the police forces throughout the United Kingdom regarding road traffic incidents occurring on British roads where someone is injured. This site uses data obtained directly from official sources.

The study area considered the length of Battlefield Road between the A49 roundabout to the junction of Shillingston Drive. This is the same study area considered by A F Macdonald in the 2019 TA.

During the period 2015 to 2019, the period for which the latest statistics are available, a total of 60 months, there were three PICs recorded within the study area. Of these recorded collisions all were classified as slight. A summary of the PIC data is set out in the table over.

	DATE/ TIME	SEVERITY	ROAD CONDIT -ION	LIGHT CONDITION	LOCATION	CAUSATION
1	20.03.18 0804	Slight	Dry	Light	Battlefield Road junction Mayfield Close	Electric motorcycle collides with following car in the act of turning right.
2	12.12.18 1800	Slight	Dry	Dark	A49 roundabout	Taxi collides with young motorcyclist whilst negotiating roundabout.
3	18.08.19 1153	Slight	Dry	Light	Battlefield Road junction Mayfield Close	Car waiting to turn right holds up car proceeding straight on which is then hit by third vehicle failing to slow down.

The analysis of this collision data confirms that there is no evidence of any existing road safety problem in the vicinity of the proposed development.

It is not anticipated that there will be an increase in frequency or severity of PICs resulting from the proposed development. Therefore, no safety mitigation measures are proposed.

3 A F Macdonald & Partners Transport Assessment

To support the planning application that was granted planning permission for 100 houses on land off Battlefield Road, Shrewsbury in 2019 (outline planning permission 19/03905/OUT), a transport assessment (TA) was produced by A F Macdonald and Partners and followed guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government.

Chapter 2 of this TA reviews the national and local policies that were relevant at the time the TA was prepared. These were the NPPF and the Shropshire Core Strategy. The TA points out that the Core Strategy had been adopted at that time but the SAMDev proposals had not.

A F Macdonald explained that the SAMDev proposals had been submitted to central government and examined by an Inspector, after which some modifications were being considered before its adoption. The TA noted that draft policy 3.16 dealt with the allocation of sites for development, including a schedule S16.1a that included the application site (SHREW095 and 115/ELR0006) and noted it would comprise around 100 dwellings and part of the site could be used for employment purposes.

Chapter 3 of the TA went on to describe the proposed development and indicated that the TA was to support a development of up to 100 dwellings. At that time, it was intended that a new junction to serve the development would be constructed on Battlefield Road in the vicinity of number 53.

Chapter 4 examined existing conditions in the area at the time including a description of Battlefield Road and analysed traffic flows on that section of road at the time the surveys were carried out.

Chapter 5 deals with traffic generation from a development comprising 100 dwellings. A F Macdonald commissioned the TRICS Consortium to prepare a bespoke interrogation of the TRICS data using a range of 50 to 150 dwellings applying the normal criteria of houses in private ownership but excluding Saturday and Sunday surveys, sites in London and using edge of town sites only.

This chapter went on to explain in some detail how the appropriate trip rates had been derived and compared it with the traffic count data that had been obtained from the Mayfield Close junction count. The conclusion was that the TRICS data would be appropriate to use for this application.

The next chapter examined sustainable travel, noting that the site was within a relatively short distance of several food stores with some non-food outlets being located off Arlington Way.

In terms of cycling, A F Macdonald noted that there is a traffic-free cycle route running along the southern side of the A5124 starting approximately 150 metres south of the A49 roundabout and a further cycle route, linking into the town centre, commenced approximately 700 metres south of the site access.

Chapter 9 examined the accident record for Battlefield Road between the roundabout with the A49 and Shillingston Drive. The analysis showed at that time there had been seven accidents clustered at the A49 roundabout but none on Battlefield Road close to the site or within 200 metres of the proposed site access. A F Macdonald concluded there was no need for further analysis of the “accident” records as none appear to impact on the sphere of influence of the proposed access point.

Chapter 10 dealt essentially with traffic growth and the application of TEMPRO factors to project future traffic growth and applied this to analysis of the new site access using the industry standard computer program PICADY8.

Chapter 12 dealt with construction traffic, noting that a construction management plan would be required and would be produced at the appropriate time.

Chapter 13 summarised the work undertaken and concluded that the site had been shown to be accessible, there would be no material adverse traffic impact and from a traffic perspective the application was recommended for approval, which in due course it was.

4 National and Local Transport Policies

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework 2019

In February 2019 the Government published the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out their planning policies for England and how they should be applied. It therefore provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other developments can be produced.

At a very high level the key to NPPF is achieving sustainable development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supported ways, namely:

- (a) An economic objective – to help build a strong responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and by identifying and co-ordinating the provision of infrastructure.
- (b) A social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations.
- (c) An environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment, including the most effective use of land and ways of moving to a low carbon economy.

However, it is important that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way and at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay, or, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the key policies are out of date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework, taken as a whole.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan permission should not usually be granted.

Local planning authorities (LPA) may make decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate the plan should not be followed.

Section 3 of the new NPPF deals with plan making and states that plans should be appropriate with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development; be prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but at the same time deliverable, and be shaped by effective engagement between plan makers, communities, infrastructure providers and statutory consultees.

The policies should be clearly written and unambiguous and be easily accessible through the use of digital tools and serve a clear purpose, and at the same time avoid unnecessary duplication of policies.

The development plan must include strategic policies and the LPA's priorities for the development and use of land in its area, whilst policies to address non-strategic matters should be included in local plans or neighbourhood plans.

The development plan for an area should comprise a combination of strategic and non-strategic policies in force at a particular time. Strategic policies are identified as being housing, infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, security and water and waste management.

Other strategic policies should cover community facilities and conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment.

Plans should explain whether policies are strategic and cover a minimum of 15 years from the date of adoption.

NPPF importantly notes that LPAs and County Councils are under a duty to co-operate with each other and with other prescribed bodies on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries.

In particular, joint working should help determine whether additional infrastructure is necessary and whether development needs that cannot be met wholly within a particular plan could be met elsewhere.

In order to demonstrate effective and on-going joint working, strategic policy making authorities should prepare and maintain a statement of common ground.

Non-strategic policies should be used by LPAs and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or type of development.

Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area and once a neighbourhood plan has been brought into force its policies take precedence over existing known strategic policies in the local plan.

The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date information that should be adequate, proportionate and focussed totally on supporting and justifying the policies concerned whilst taking into account relevant market signals.

Policies in local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need up-dating at least once every five years and then up-dated as necessary.

Section 4 of NPPF covers decision making and states that LPAs should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way and decision makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

NPPF notes that early engagement has significant potential to improve efficiency and effectiveness of the planning application system for all parties and good quality pre-application discussion enables better co-ordination and improved outcomes for the community. It goes on to say that the more issues that can be resolved at pre-application stage, the greater the benefits.

Applicants and LPAs should consider the potential for voluntary planning performance agreements where this might achieve a fast and more effective application process.

These are likely to be needed for applications that are particularly large or complex to determine. Decisions on applications should be made as quickly as possible and within statutory time scales unless a longer period has been agreed by the applicants in writing.

The local planning authorities should also consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. However, planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.

Planning conditions should also be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

The retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities should also be encouraged.

Promoting healthy and safe communities is dealt with in Section 8 of the revised NPPF. Planning policies and decisions should therefore aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which:

- ❖ promote social inclusion, including opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other;
- ❖ are safe and accessible so that crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion; and
- ❖ enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and wellbeing needs; for example, layouts that encourage walking and cycling.

To provide facilities and services the community needs planning policies and decisions which:

- ❖ plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and community facilities;
- ❖ take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve the health and wellbeing of all sections of the community;
- ❖ guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services;
- ❖ ensure that established shops, facilities and services are built, developed and modernised; and
- ❖ ensure an integrated approach is taken when considering the location of housing, economic uses, community facilities and services.

Section 9 deals with promoting sustainable transport, stating that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan making and development proposals so that:

- ❖ the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;
- ❖ opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure and changing transport technology and usage are realised;
- ❖ opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued; and
- ❖ the environmental impact of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account and patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places.

This section goes on to say that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives and significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable; but noting that opportunities for sustainable transport will vary between urban and rural areas and this should be taken into account in both plan making and decision making.

Planning policies should therefore:

- ❖ support an appropriate mix of uses across an area and within larger scale sites to minimise the number and length of journeys;
- ❖ be prepared with the active involvement of local highway authorities, other transport infrastructure providers and operators and neighbouring councils;
- ❖ identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice;
- ❖ provide for high quality walking and cycling networks; and
- ❖ provide for any large scale transport infrastructure that needs to be located in the area.

This Section also deals with parking standards and states that if local parking standards for residential and non-residential developments are set, policies should take account of:

- ❖ the accessibility of the development;
- ❖ the type, mix and use of the development;
- ❖ availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- ❖ local car ownership levels; and
- ❖ adequate provision for spaces for charging plug-in points.

It goes on to say maximum parking standards should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary.

When considering development proposals, it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport have been taken up and that the site location provides safe and suitable access for all users and any significant impacts from the development on the transport network can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.

As before, at paragraph 109, the revised NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impact on the road network would be severe.

Within this context, applications for development should give priority first to pedestrians and cyclists and secondly as far as possible facilitate access to high quality public transport.

It is also important to address the needs of people with disabilities and create places that are safe, secure and attractive whilst allowing for efficient delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles.

Section 9 states that all development that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

Supporting high quality communications is dealt with at Section 10, stating that advanced high quality and reliable communication infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social wellbeing and planning policies and designs should support the expansion of communication networks including next generation mobile technology and full fibre broadband connection.

Section 11 is about making effective use of land and states that planning policies and designs should promote an effective use of land in meeting the needs for homes and other uses whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions.

Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously developed or brown field land.

The creation of high quality buildings and places is dealt with at Section 12 and is considered fundamental to what the planning and development processes should achieve.

Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. It is important to effectively engage between applicants, communities, local planning authorities and other interest groups through the determination process.

Section 14 deals with meeting the challenge of climate change and notes that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate making sure that full account is made of flood risk and coastal change.

The planning system should help to shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience. It should also encourage the reuse of existing resources including conversion of existing buildings and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.

Plans should therefore take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change taking into account long term implications of flood risk, coastal change and wider support of biodiversity landscapes and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures.

Policies should support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure such as providing space for physical protection or making provision for the possible future relocation of vulnerable infrastructure.

Annex 1 deals with implementation of the revised NPPF and at paragraph 212 notes that policies in this Framework are material considerations that should be taken into account when dealing with planning applications from the day of its publication.

It notes that Plans may also need to be revised to reflect policy changes which this replacement Framework has made and should be progressed as quickly as possible either through partial revision or by preparing a new plan.

4.2 Transport White Paper – The Future of Transport: A Network for 2030

The thrust of the White Paper is one of sustainability and the integration of transport systems and modes. The main aim of the White Paper is to increase choice by improving sustainable transport alternatives. This recognises that building more roads is not the only solution to accommodate growth. The White Paper stresses the responsibility for reducing congestion, providing safer streets, improving air quality, giving real transport choice and raising the quality of life for all.

Achieving these goals means some people using their cars less often, more people walking, cycling and using public transport, and everybody thinking more about their transport choices.

4.3 Smarter Choices

The publication of the “Smarter Choices – Changing the Way We Travel” report by the DfT in July 2004 has further reinforced the stature of soft measures within the overall context of transport planning. These soft measures encompass workplace and school travel plans, as well as other initiatives such as car sharing schemes, car clubs, personalised journey planning, teleworking, teleconferencing, information and marketing, and home shopping.

These measures are becoming increasingly important issues for the DfT and the provision of targeted information, marketing and incentives are receiving much higher priority. The research into ‘soft’ measures that was published in the report has been viewed as a significant milestone. As such, soft measures have a role in their own right in raising awareness of the available journey options and as a support measure for other more traditional interventions in the transport arena, such as mobility management schemes, infrastructure and service-related measures.

4.4 National Planning Policy Guidance

In March 2014 the government launched the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) website. The guidance is a significant step forward in making planning guidance easier and simpler for practitioners and the public. The publication of the guidance gives greater certainty to planners and communities which will help both deliver the high quality development and sustainable growth that England needs, reinforcing the aims of NPPF as discussed above.

The guidance provides advice on when transport assessments and transport statements are required, and what they should contain. Included within this guidance is the following relevant section:

“Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements should be:

- ❖ *proportionate to the size and scope of the proposed development to which they relate and build on existing information wherever possible;*
- ❖ *established at the earliest practicable possible stage of a development proposal;*
- ❖ *be tailored to particular local circumstances (other locally-determined factors and information beyond those which are set out in this guidance may need to be considered in these studies provided there is robust evidence for doing so locally);*
- ❖ *be brought forward through collaborative ongoing working between the Local Planning Authority/ Transport Authority, transport operators, Rail Network Operators, Highways Agency where there may be implications for the strategic road network and other relevant bodies. Engaging communities and local*

businesses in Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements can be beneficial in positively supporting higher levels of walking and cycling (which in turn can encourage greater social inclusion, community cohesion and healthier communities)."

Savoy Consulting believes that this TA accords with the guidance and provides ways of assessing and mitigating any negative transport impacts of the development in order to promote sustainable development using the appropriate advice above.

Local strategy with respect to land use and transport is set out in statutory documents prepared by planning and highway authorities which, for this development, comprise:

- ❖ Shropshire Adopted Core Strategy (2011); and
- ❖ Shropshire Local Transport Plan (2011 - 2026).

Local Policy

4.5 Shropshire Adopted Core Strategy (2011)

The Core Strategy sets out the development framework for Shropshire to be carried forward by the policy approach in the adopted SAMDev Plan.

The Core Strategy approach is one of sustainable growth for Shropshire delivered in a locally responsive manner, with the objective of making communities more resilient and adaptable to the challenges of the 21st century.

The Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) is the primary document of the Shropshire Local Development Framework (LDF) and was adopted on 24th February 2011. The LDF comprises a number of documents that set out policies relating to the use and development of land in Shropshire.

The Core Strategy is most important of these documents and sets out strategic policies and the broad spatial strategy to guide future development and growth in Shropshire during the period to 2026.

Policy CS1 deals with the Strategic Approach for the Core Strategy stating that Shropshire will flourish, accommodating investment and new development to contribute to meeting its needs and to make its settlements more sustainable, delivering over the plan period 2006-2026, around 27,500 new homes, of which 9,000 will be "affordable housing", around 290 hectares of employment land, and accompanying infrastructure across Shropshire in the following places:

- ❖ Shrewsbury, as a sub-regional centre and Shropshire's growth point, will be the focus for significant retail, office and employment development, and accommodate approximately 25% of Shropshire's residential development over the plan period;

- ❖ The Market Towns and other Key Centres will maintain and enhance their traditional roles in providing services and employment, accommodating around 40% of Shropshire’s residential development over the plan period;
- ❖ The rural areas will become more sustainable through a “rural rebalance” approach, accommodating around 35% of Shropshire’s residential development over the plan period.

Development and investment will be located predominantly in community hubs and community clusters, and will contribute to social and economic vitality. Outside these settlements, development will primarily be for economic diversification and to meet the needs of the local communities for affordable housing.

The Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) DPD will make provision for housing and employment needs in the towns, Key Centres and rural areas having regard to the differing pressures, opportunities and constraints in the spatial zone.

Policy CS2 also states that the SUE at Shrewsbury West is to provide approximately 700 dwellings north of Welshpool Road, 9-12 ha of employment land, a new link road connecting Churncote Island on the A5 to Holyhead Road, enhancement of the Park and Ride facility, and other transport improvements, new community facilities, and the potential for new health and care facilities. A second SUE is also planned at Shrewsbury South.

In relation to sustainable design, Policy CS6 states that development is to be of high quality design using sustainable design principles to achieve accessible and inclusive environments.

Proposals which are likely to generate high levels of traffic are to be located in accessible locations which maximise public transport, walking and cycling, and reduce the need to travel by car.

The Core Strategy policy which relates to transport is Policy CS7 (Communication and Transport) and is outlined below:

“A sustainable pattern of development requires the maintenance and improvement of integrated, accessible, attractive, safe and reliable communication and transport infrastructure and services. These need to provide a range of opportunities for communication and transport which meet social, economic and environmental objectives by improving accessibility, managing the need to travel, offering options for different travel needs and reducing the impacts of transport”.

In relation to Shrewsbury, Policy CS2 indicates that 6,500 dwellings are to be delivered within the plan period at a rate of 325 dwellings a year and 90 ha of employment land. To achieve the aims for the town, two SUEs (Sustainable Urban Extensions) are to be brought forward at Shrewsbury South and Shrewsbury West to deliver 25% of the residential and 50% of the employment allocations for Shrewsbury.

4.6 SAMDev Plan 2006-2026

The SAMDev element of the Local Plan therefore has a vital role in delivering community led aspirations for sustainable development and in particular providing the opportunity for new development to contribute to locally identified infrastructure needs.

The Site Allocations and Development Management (SAMDev) Plan, which was adopted in December 2015, sets out proposals for the use of land and policies to guide future development in order to help to deliver the Vision and Objectives of the Core Strategy for the period up to 2026.

The SAMDev Plan supports the Council's commitment to sustainability and will make a positive contribution to delivering sustainable communities by setting out detailed policies to deliver sustainable development across Shropshire. The amount of development in Shropshire up to 2026 is already established by the Core Strategy.

The SAMDev Plan has been subject to extensive consultation over several years and also sets out further detailed policies for the management of new development across Shropshire to complement the policies already adopted in the Shropshire Core Strategy, and to provide a greater level of detail on a number of planning issues.

The SAMDev Plan document sets out the following:

- ❖ Development Management policies which provide specific guidance to meet national policy requirements principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) or to provide more detailed guidance to supplement those policies already adopted in the Core Strategy;
- ❖ Settlement policies and site allocations (where relevant) for the market towns and key centres and community hubs and clusters in each of the 'Place Plan' areas;
- ❖ The policies and proposals of the Plan are illustrated in the Policies Map and in Inset Maps for each settlement where development is proposed.

The SAMDev Plan document largely follows the structure set out in the Revised Preferred Options consultation in 2013, although some of the policies have been sub-divided for clarity. The settlement policies are grouped by areas which reflect approximate functional zones of influence (known as 'Place Plans') of each of the 18 market towns and key centres, and this is also reflected in the grouping of inset maps.

The SAMDev policies continue the approach adopted in the Core Strategy of flexibility and added value without repetition of national level guidance or the risk of early obsolescence.

Added value comes particularly at the local level, the policies fully support the development and importance of Community Led Plans and recognise the significance of the AONB Management Plan. The policies also fully establish the link between infrastructure requirements set out in the Place Plans and the planning process.

The scope of the Development Management policies is therefore largely defined by the Core Strategy and the requirements of national policy.

The combination of explanatory text, evidence base and Inspector's Report provides stakeholders, with the justification for the chosen policy approach, set against the fixed background of the policies already laid down in the Core Strategy and the options for alternative policy approaches considered during that process.

Table MD1.1 below follows the strategic approach of Policy CS1, showing the planned housing provision in relation to the approximate proportional split between Shrewsbury (25%), the Market Towns and other Key Centres (40%), and the rural areas, including the Community Hubs and Cluster Settlements (35%). The table also identifies employment land allocations.

Table MD1.1

Housing	Number of dwellings			
	Built 2006-2013	Committed* 2013	Planned 2006-2026 (approximate)	Remaining to deliver to 2016
Shrewsbury	1,602	957	6,500	3,941
Market towns/key centres	3,355	2,273	11,000	5,372
Rural areas	2,314	2,259	10,000	5,427
TOTAL	7,271	5,489	27,500	14,740
Employment Land	Hectares			
	Built 2006-2013	Committed* 2013	Planned 2006-2026 (approximate)	Remaining to deliver to 2016
Shrewsbury	27	23	90	40
Market towns/key centres	14	91	130	25
Rural areas	26	19	70	25
TOTAL	67	133	290	90

*Committed = those with planning permission at 01.04.2013

4.7 Shropshire Local Transport Plan (2011 - 2026)

Following a period of public consultation, Shropshire Council is currently finalising the Shropshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2011-2026. The LTP is made up of a number of documents which includes:

Provisional LTP Strategy (2011 – 2026) and the LTP Implementation Plan (2012).

The Provisional LTP Strategy is the primary document that outlines the challenges facing Shropshire’s transport network. It sets out the vision aims and objectives, and details the policies Shropshire Council and its partners will implement to address the challenges and achieve the objectives covering the period up to 2026.

The key objectives of the Provisional LTP Strategy in relation to Traffic and Transport can be summarised as delivering reliable and efficient transport networks and services to support local economies through improving connectivity and access, especially by sustainable modes of transport.

- ❖ Support growth and ensure that new housing / employment areas encourage sustainable travel behaviour.
- ❖ Minimise the impact on transport on the local environment and reduce transport related carbon emissions.
- ❖ Maintain the condition of the highway network and improve safety.
- ❖ Promoting greater equality of opportunity for all by improving people’s access to all necessary services and facilities ensuring transport helps improve quality of life.
- ❖ Encourage more active modes of travel such as walking and cycling.

5 Proposed Development

5.1 Introduction

The proposed development comprises two elements. The first is a residential development of 130 houses and the second is for employment land comprising 2695 sq.m. business units and 1726 sq.m. of office/leisure use. The precise mix and use of the commercial element will be driven by market conditions once planning permission has been granted.

The primary access to the residential development will be from Mayfield Close and access to the employment land will be by means of a new priority junction at the southern end of the application site. This new junction will form a staggered T-junction with Shillingston Drive and benefit from a right turning lane mirroring the provision serving the existing junction on the opposite side of the road.

As part of the development, an 'emergency' access could be provided in due course to the residential development from the access road serving the employment land.

A site layout has been submitted as part of the planning application which has been produced by the project architects Sutton and Wilkinson. The drawing illustrates the proposed means of access to the two elements of the development, the location of the proposed dwellings and possible employment units and the layout of the internal road network.

5.2 Site Access Arrangements

Main access to the residential development will be from Mayfield Close and access to the employment land will be from a new priority junction on Battlefield Road near the junction of Shillingston Drive.

The junction design for the employment land element of the development is attached at **Appendix A**. This incorporates a right hand turning lane, a new 5.5 metre wide carriageway, 10.5 metre junction radii and visibility splays of 2.4m x 60m. These are considered appropriate for Battlefield Road and accord with the standards adopted previously for new junctions on this road.

The proposed vehicular access will also provide access for pedestrians and cyclists. Due to the relatively low vehicle traffic volumes anticipated to use the new site access, even in the peak hours, segregated provision for cyclists has not been considered necessary.

6 Accessibility

6.1 Introduction

The proposed residential development is well served by a range of educational establishments, retail, community and health facilities within maximum recommended walking or cycling distance of the site.

6.2 Guidance

In transport planning terms, the most sustainable sites are those generating fewest private vehicle trips, which would be achieved by enabling a greater proportion of walking, cycling and public transport journeys. This can be considered in terms of a site's distance from local services and resident catchment.

The Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) "Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot (2000)" provides guidance when considering accessibility of specific locations by foot. In relation to the proposed development, the guidelines suggest:

- ❖ Maximum distances of 800m to town centres, 2000m for work/education, leisure and 1200m elsewhere.
- ❖ Acceptable distances of 400m to town centres, 1000m for work/education. Leisure and 800m elsewhere.
- ❖ Desirable distances of 200m to town centres, 500m for work/education, leisure and 400 m elsewhere.

As suggested by the IHT, an average walking speed is given as 4.8 km/h, or 5 minutes for every 400m. The 'maximum' distances quoted above represent a walk of 10 minutes (town centres), 25 minutes (work/education/leisure) and 15 minutes (elsewhere).

6.3 Public Transport Links

A summary of the bus service that runs along Battlefield Road is included in the table below:

Route No and Operator	Details	Monday-Saturday	Sunday
511 Arriva Midlands North	Shrewsbury - Wem	0557,0652,0731,0851,1051,1151, 1251,1416,1501,1631,1716,1816	No service

Source: arrivabus.co.uk October 2020

The nearest bus stops to the application site are situated on Battlefield Road in the immediate vicinity of the Red Lion Hotel.

From Shrewsbury Railway Station many regional destinations can be reached using regular train services. The key services are summarised in the table below:

Rail Services from Shrewsbury

Route	First/Last Train	Peak Frequency
Manchester Piccadilly-Milford Haven	2 hourly	0630-1708
Shrewsbury-Birmingham New Street	30 minutes	0518-2332
Birmingham International-Holyhead	1 hourly	0625-1823
Shrewsbury-Crewe	1 hourly	0544-2314
Manchester Piccadilly to Carmarthen	2 hourly	0511-1905
Holyhead to Cardiff Central	1 hourly	0425-2055
Birmingham International to Aberystwyth	2 hourly	0625-1930

Source: National Rail Website October 2020.

6.4 Local Amenities

An analysis has been carried out of the local amenities in the area and the results are set out below.

TYPE OF AMENITY NAME	DISTANCE FROM SITE	JOURNEY TIME ON FOOT	JOURNEY TIME BY BICYCLE
Sundorne Retail Park	850 m	10 mins	3 mins
Xercise4Less Gym	1 km	12 mins	4 mins
Tesco Extra and Pharmacy	1.1 km	13 mins	4 mins
Aldi	1.3 km	-	5 mins
Ambleside Dental Practice	1.6 km	-	6 mins
Shrewsbury Academy Secondary School	1.8 km	-	7 mins
Severn Fields Medical Practice	2.2 km	-	9 mins
Sundorne Avenue Post Office and Premier store	2.2 km	-	9 mins
Sundorne Infant School and Nursery	2.2 km	-	9 mins
The Grange Primary School	2.5 km	-	10 mins

Shrewsbury town centre currently has a full range of retail shops, including *inter alia*, Marks and Spencer, Next, Peacocks, River island, Top Shop, Boots and Clarke's Shoes.

6.5 Summary and Conclusions

From examining the walking distances quoted above it is possible to walk to some of the local amenities within 13 minutes once leaving the proposed development. Similarly, from the cycle distances quoted it has been established that it is possible to reach all of the local amenities within a ten minute cycle ride.

In summary therefore it can be readily seen that the proposed development is in a sustainable location where all necessary day to day amenities can be reached on foot or by bicycle without any of the future residents needing to use a private car to reach their required destination.

It can therefore be concluded that this site is situated in an entirely sustainable location.

7 Traffic Impact and Junction Analysis

7.1 Introduction

This chapter of the report assesses the impact of traffic generated by the proposed development on the local highway network in the study area. In line with the previous transport assessment produced by A F Macdonald and Partners the only junction where potentially material traffic impacts are forecast to occur was the junction of Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close.

7.2 Traffic Impact

As part of the assessment of the local highway network the junction of Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close has been examined in terms of its operational capacity.

Because of the current lockdown conditions resulting from the COVID19 restrictions it has not been possible to undertake any fresh meaningful junction counts on Battlefield Road. It has been necessary to reuse the extensive traffic surveys that were carried out by A F Macdonald in 2015.

7.3 Assessment Periods

It was established from analysing the traffic surveys that the weekday AM and PM peak hour periods on the local highway network were from 0745 to 0845 hours and 1645 to 1745 hours.

7.4 Traffic Generation

This section deals with the predicted traffic generation for the proposed residential development.

Based on information taken from the TRICS database obtained by A F Macdonald from the TRICS Consortium (**results attached at Appendix B**) for developments of a similar size, the following trip rates were obtained:

Table 7.1: Trip Rate Information

Peak Period	Trip Rates (per dwelling)			Traffic Generation (130 dwellings)		
	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way
AM Peak	0.168	0.462	0.630	22	60	82
PM Peak	0.414	0.207	0.621	54	27	81

7.5 Traffic Growth

In the Department for Transport (DfT) document 'Guidance on Transport Assessment', at Paragraph 4.47 it states that *"the assessment year(s) in respect of capacity analysis for the transport network should be consistent with size, scale and completion schedule of the proposed development"*.

Paragraph 4.47 of the Guidance says that *"for the local transport network, a development should be assessed with regard to the LDF, and for a period of no less than five years after the date of registration of a planning application"*.

Paragraph 4.48 goes on to say that *"for the strategic road network, the future assessment year should normally be ten years after the date of registration of a planning application for the development"*.

As the junction of Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close lies on the strategic road network, Savoy Consulting considers it appropriate to carry out a capacity assessment for this junction for a future year of 2030.

In order to test future year scenarios, it was necessary to apply traffic growth factors to the baseline year of 2015 to obtain the future year of 2020 and 2030.

The AM and PM growth rates covering the Battlefield Ward of Shrewsbury for background traffic growth for 2015 to a future year of 2020 and 2030 are summarised in **Table 7.2** below.

Table 7.2: TEMPro 7.2b for the local MSOA Shropshire 016

Growth Period	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
2015 to 2020	1.0717	1.0678
2015 to 2030	1.1642	1.1546

7.6 Trip Distribution

In order to establish the likely distribution profile of traffic generated by the proposed residential development, the existing travel patterns on Battlefield Road have been utilised.

Assuming a similar trip distribution profile will be observed following completion of the proposed development, the traffic generated by the development onto the local highway network during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, is summarised in **Table 7.3** and **Table 7.4** over.

Table 7.3 Traffic Flows – Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close

Arm A Battlefield Road (S)

Arm B Site Access

Arm C Battlefield Road (N)

Table 7.3 Existing Flows 2015

AM Peak 2015	A	B	C
A		0	418
B	0		0
C	658	0	

AM Peak 2015	A	B	C
A		0	679
B	0		0
C	645	0	

Table 7.4 Traffic Flows Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close (Existing + Development Traffic)

AM Peak Dev Traffic	A	B	C
A		11	0
B	41		33
C	0	15	

AM Peak Dev Traffic	A	B	C
A		30	0
B	15		15
C	0	31	

7.6 Junction Battlefield Road/Mayfield Close

This priority junction has been assessed using the computer program PICADY9 for the 2020 and 2030 peak hours using development flows only.

The results are summarised in **Tables 7.1** below with the full analysis attached at **Appendix C**.

Table 7.5: 2020 Base + Development

Arm A: Battlefield Road (S)

Arm B: Site Access

Arm C: Battlefield Road (N)

ARM/ MOVEMENT	AM PEAK			PM PEAK		
	QUEUE	DELAY(S)	RFC	QUEUE	DELAY(S)	RFC
Stream B to A C	0.3	12.86	0.23	0.1	13.90	0.11
Stream C to A B	0.1	4.15	0.06	0.4	4.55	0.14

Table 7.7: 2030 Base + Development

Arm A: Battlefield Road (S)
 Arm B: Site Access
 Arm C: Battlefield Road (N)

ARM/ MOVEMENT	AM PEAK			PM PEAK		
	QUEUE	DELAY(S)	RFC	QUEUE	DELAY(S)	RFC
Stream B to A C	0.3	13.79	0.24	0.1	15.39	0.12
Stream C to A B	0.1	4.05	0.08	0.4	4.55	0.15

From examining the results of the analysis of this junction it is quite clear the capacity of the site access is well within acceptable thresholds under all scenarios, as are the Ratio of Flow to Capacities.

8 Summary and Conclusions

This Transport Assessment has been prepared using the advice set out in the Departments for Transport and Communities and Local Government publication 'Guidance on Transport Assessment' (March 2007) and supports two planning application submitted on behalf of Jessup for a residential and commercial development on land west of Battlefield Road, Shrewsbury.

The proposed development comprises a residential development of 130 dwellings and approximately 4400 sq.m. of employment comprising potentially small industrial units, a leisure use and provision of office space.

Primary access to the residential development will be by means of the existing Mayfield Close junction on Battlefield Road and access to the employment land will be by means of a new priority junction, also on Battlefield Road in the vicinity of Shillingston Drive.

This Transport Assessment has applied the advice set out in the Departments for Transport and Communities and Local Government publication 'Guidance on Transport Assessment' (March 2007).

The report has considered the current operation of the local highway network and has assessed its suitability to accommodate the traffic that is likely to be generated by the proposal. It has also considered the road safety record of the highway network.

The Transport Assessment has assessed the sustainability and accessibility of the site, including its proximity to local public transport services and the local amenities available to the new residents within acceptable travelling distances by a variety of transport modes.

The traffic impact assessment has demonstrated that the development generated trips will be low compared to existing background traffic flows and the resulting traffic flows can be safely and satisfactorily accommodated on the local highway.

The Transport Assessment has also demonstrated that the residual cumulative impact of the proposed residential development cannot be considered to be "severe" as defined by paragraph 32 of the NPPF, and therefore the development should not be prevented or refused on highway or transport grounds.