
HIGHWAYS RESPONSE

To: Michael Butler
Principal Planning Officer

Our Ref: 22/00244/FULEXT

From: Paul Goddard
Highways Development Control
Team Leader

Your Ref: 22/00244/FULEXT

Extn: 2207

Date: May 4th 2022

**Land rear of The Hollies, Reading Road, Burghfield Common
Erection of 32 dwellings including affordable housing, parking, and landscaping.
Access via Regis Manor Road.**

1. I refer to the above planning application. We have reviewed all relevant submissions including the Transport Statement (TS) from Cole Easdon, and the many letters of representation received.
2. This site is already allocated for housing within Policy HSA 16 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD (2006-2026) 2017. For 32 dwellings, the TS suggests that this would result in some 144 vehicle movements per day (72 out, 72 in) with some 14 vehicle movements during weekday peak travel periods. I would suggest a higher level of 176 vehicle movements per day. However in my view, this difference is not sufficient to cause concern. Also, it must be stated that traffic levels would have been considered during the allocation. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) remains of the view that the development would not cause any impact on the highway and travel network that would be considered as severe.
3. As with the TS, I consider that the development is well connected to the rest of Burghfield Common, and this includes a recently widened and improved footway along the Reading Road. Also, again connectivity and sustainability would have been considered during the allocation of the site.
4. Access is obtained via Regis Manor Road. Unfortunately, this road is not adopted as public highway as the developer Crest Nicholson refused to have the road adopted as public highway. This is despite being strongly encouraged to do so. This is most unsatisfactory, and means that the LHA is also unable to adopt any infrastructure within this development. I would like to object to this proposal on this basis, as there is no option of providing an adopted road that then serve the residents that would live in this proposal. It is also unknown what this developer can do, or intends to do to overcome this issue.
5. I would refer to the car parking standards within Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD. From the site layout plan, it would seem that not only is there insufficient car parking provided to comply with Policy P1, but also Policy P1 clearly states that garages are no counted as car parking spaces, as they are mostly never used for such. Unless this is overcome, then this must be a further issue for objection.
6. Any parking between walls and any other structures should be 3.0 metres wide to enable car doors to be opened etc. Each dwelling should also be provided with an electric vehicle charging point.

7. I consider that cycle storage facilities are provided.
8. The road layout would appear to be acceptable, but details are required on levels. I am concerned regarding the potential gradient of the site. Any raised table/road narrowing traffic calming feature should be laid with no level change and could use alternative surfacing to highlight it.
9. In conclusion, currently I am minded to object to the proposal on the two grounds outlined above

Paul Goddard
Highways Development Control Team Leader