

DW Transportation Limited, 9 Baron Road, Penarth, CF64 3UD | Telephone: 07976 219322 | Email: info@dwtransportation.com

JMS Planning & Development Ltd Valley Farm Rumburgh Rd Halesworth IP19 ONQ

Tuesday 6 December 2022

Our Ref: DWT314/061222

Dear Mr Sutton

RE: PLANNING REF 22/02168/F

As requested, I write with respect to the above planning application and specifically to reply to the highways consultation response from Bristol City Council's Transport Development Management (TDM) team as found on the Decision Notice dated 5 September 2022.

My Background

I have significant experience in highways and transport planning for development having worked in the industry since 1992. I am a qualified civil engineer (Higher National Certificate, 1996) and an Incorporated Engineer (IEng, 2002). I formed DW Transportation Limited in 2011 and currently act as Managing Director for the company.

Reasons for Refusal

There are two specific points made by TDM leading to its recommendation to refuse the planning application, these are:

- 1. Visibility from Hampton Road to traffic emerging from the EV spaces; and
- 2. The absence of swept path diagrams showing how traffic would enter/leave the EV spaces.

I address both of these points in turn below.

1. Visibility

It is the opinion of TDM that traffic entering the site would be at greater risk as a result of the visibility that would be available to traffic entering the site (presumably from the west only) to cars exiting the EV sapces. The Council has requested the applicant to demonstrate "adequate vehicular visibility splays" but without stating any standard or guidance for any such requirement. Typically, visibility standards only deal with traffic at junctions (visibility splays) or along the carriageway (forward visibility), both of which are based on a required Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) as calculated from the speed of traffic. The crossover in question is an ingress only and so no visibility splay

standard would apply. In terms of forward visibility, any vehicle turning in to the site would be doing so at an appropriately low speed (5-10mph). For traffic travelling at this speed, the Manual for Streets Table 7.1 advises an SSD of 11 metres. Notwithstanding any of the points made above, Drawing 01 enclosed has been produced to illustrate indicatively the intervisibility between vehicles exiting the EV bays and traffic turning into the site from the west. The drawing indicates that visibility splays of 10-14.5m are achievable, which is perfectly acceptable for such a low-speed situation.

2. Swept Path Analysis

The planning application was refused because no swept paths were provided to show how vehicles would negotiate the EV Bays. These swept paths have been undertaken using a large car and shown on the enclosed Drawing 01. The swept paths clearly demonstrate that the EV bays are easily accessible.

Conclusion and Closure

In conclusion, both of the reasons for recommending a refusal by TDM have been demonstrated to be non-issues with both adequate visibility being provided and swept paths provided to show no manoeuvring issues at the EV bays.

I would therefore advise that you kindly request that the appeal be allowed on highway safety grounds.

Yours sincerely,



Dean Watkins IEng, MCIHT

Managing Director
DW Transportation Limited

Encl:

Drawing 01 – Visibility Splays and Swept Path Analysis

