

ashleyhelme

Land off Henthorn Road,
Clitheroe

APPEAL REF:
APP/T2350/W/19/3221189

Accessibility Evidence
of Simon Helme,
Ashley Helme Associates Ltd



April 2019

Report Reference 1616/4/B

Accessibility Evidence of Simon Helme, Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

Report Ref: 1616/4/B

Status: Final

Date: April 2019

Ashley Helme Associates Ltd
76 Washway Road
SALE, Manchester
M33 7RE

Telephone
0161 972 0552

aha@ashleyhelme.co.uk
www.ashleyhelme.co.uk

COPYRIGHT

© 2019 by Ashley Helme Associates Ltd
No part of this publication may be reproduced by any means
Without the permission of Ashley Helme Associates Ltd

Accessibility Evidence of Simon Helme, Land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe

Chapter	Page
1 Introduction	1
2 Key Issues	4
3 Policy Context	7
4 Existing Conditions	15
5 Walk	25
6 Cycle	36
7 Bus Travel	41
8 Rail Travel	47
9 Summary & Conclusions	50

Figures

- 1 Walk Isochrones and Local Amenities
- 2 Highway Audit: Local Roads
- 3 Public Rights of Way
- 4 Cycle Isochrone
- 5 Bus Route Plan: Service No 2

Tables

- 1 Census Travel to Work
- 2 Walk Distances to Local Amenities
- 3 Bus Service and Frequencies

Appendices

- A LCC Email 26 July 2018
- B AHA ATC Data Henthorn Road
- C Extracts from TA 79/99 'Traffic Capacity of Urban Roads'
- D LC Accident Data
- E National Travel Survey 2017
- F Table 3.2 of CIHT 'Providing for Journeys on Foot'
- G Para 4.4.1 of Manual for Streets
- H Figure 6.8 of Manual for Streets
- I CIHT 'Planning for Walking'
- J LCC Consultation Response 5 October 2018

1 Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Simon John Helme. I hold a Bachelor of Engineering Honours Degree in Civil Engineering and a Master of Science Degree in Transportation Engineering and Planning, and I am a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
- 1.2 I am a Director of Ashley Helme Associates Ltd (AHA), and have extensive experience of the analysis of traffic behaviour and performance of highway networks, with emphasis placed on providing appropriately for the needs of all road users, issues of capacity and highway safety and transport sustainability.
- 1.3 I have 25 years of experience covering a broad range of highways and transportation issues. I have provided advice to a wide range of clients including institutional funds, house builders, commercial property developers and private land owners. I am responsible for the preparation and submission of highways and transportation information to accompany planning applications. I have acted as an expert witness at numerous planning inquiries and hearings.
- 1.4 Appeal Proposal
- 1.4.1 I am appointed by Gladman Developments Ltd (GDL) for the Appeal against the refusal of planning permission by the planning authority Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) of the residential development proposed in the planning application ref 3/2018/0688. The Appeal development is on land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe (henceforth referred to as the Appeal Site).
- 1.4.2 The development proposal comprises:
- “Outline planning application for the erection of up to 110 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (suds) and vehicular access point from Henthorn Road. all matters reserved except for means of access. Land off **Henthorn Road, Clitheroe**”

1.5 Involvement

1.5.1 I was appointed by GDL in May 2018. I prepared a Transport Assessment Scoping Study Report (ref 1616/1, June 2018) and this was sent to highways officers at Lancashire County Council (LCC) on 21 June 2018. I received a response from LCC by email on 26 July 2018 (Appendix A). Taking into account the LCC response, I prepared the following documents to accompany the planning application:

- (i) Transport Assessment: ref 1616/2/B, August 2018 (CD 1.07),
- (ii) Travel Plan: ref 1616/3/A, July 2018 (CD 1.08).

1.6 Reason for Refusal

1.6.1 The RVBC decision notice, dated 11 January 2019 (CD 2.21) states:

*"1. The proposed development would result in an unsustainable form of development **within the countryside. Due to the site's location, with a lack of cycling or suitable pedestrian access to the town centre, future residents will be wholly reliant on the car. As such the development is contrary to Key Statements DS2 and DMI2, as well as Policies DMG2 and DMG3, of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.***

1.7 Scope of Report

1.7.1 In Chapter 2 of my evidence I identify what I consider to be the key highway/transport issues.

1.7.2 In Chapter 3 of my evidence I set out the policy context to this with respect to the key highway/transport issues, and the reason for refusal.

1.7.3 I have collected a range of data to examine the RVBC reason for refusal. The data allows to me form a good understanding of the existing conditions that prevail in the locale of the Appeal Site. I set this out in Chapter 4 of my evidence.

- 1.7.4 The RVBC decision notice raises concern about the transport sustainability of the Appeal development and I examine if these claims are justified in:
- (i) Chapter 5: Walk,
 - (ii) Chapter 6: Cycle,
 - (iii) Chapter 7: Bus Travel,
 - (iv) Chapter 8: Rail Travel.
- 1.7.5 My conclusions are presented in Chapter 9.
- 1.8 Endorsement
- 1.8.1 The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this Appeal reference APP/T2350/W/19/3221189 (in this proof of evidence) is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.
- 1.9 Statement of Common Ground
- 1.9.1 An Accessibility Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared. At the time of preparing this evidence, the SoCG is being discussed with officers at RVBC. It is anticipated that this will be signed by both parties and will assist the public inquiry.

2 Key Issues

2.1 RVBC REASON FOR REFUSAL

2.1.1 I have prepared this evidence to address reason for refusal No 1 of the of the RVBC Decision Notice (ref CD 2.21). This states:

"1. The proposed development would result in an unsustainable form of development within the countryside. Due to the site's location, with a lack of cycling or suitable pedestrian access to the town centre, future residents will be wholly reliant on the car. As such the development is contrary to Key Statements DS2 and DMI2, as well as Policies DMG2 and DMG3, of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2.2 WALK

2.2.1 The RVBC reason for refusal No 1 makes specific reference to the lack of 'suitable pedestrian access to the town centre'. I consider that they key questions that need to be addressed are:

- (i) What are the existing amenities near to the Appeal Site and within the town?
- (ii) What are the walk distances between the Appeal Site and the existing amenities and what are the typical walk times for these journeys?
- (iii) What pedestrian infrastructure is available in the vicinity of the Appeal Site and along the routes that residents may use for trips to/from local amenities?
- (iv) Have there been any recorded accidents involving pedestrians in vicinity of the Appeal Site and along the routes that residents may use for trips to/from local amenities?
- (v) Does the Appeal scheme offer an acceptable level of connectivity with the wider pedestrian and local highway network?

- (vi) Does the Appeal scheme meet NPPF walking considerations for new residential development?

2.2.2 I examine these questions in Chapter 5 of my evidence.

2.3 CYCLE

2.3.1 The RVBC reason for refusal No 1 makes specific reference to the lack of 'suitable cycle access to the town centre'. I consider that the key questions that need to be addressed are:

- (i) What are the cycle distances between the Appeal Site and the existing amenities and what are the typical cycle times for these journeys?
- (ii) What routes are cycle users likely to use to access local amenities?
- (iii) Have there been any recorded accidents involving cyclists in vicinity of the Appeal Site and along the routes that residents may use for trips to/from local amenities?
- (iv) Does the Appeal scheme meet NPPF cycling considerations for new residential development?

2.3.2 I examine these questions in Chapter 6 of my evidence.

2.4 BUS

2.4.1 RVBC reason for refusal No 1 suggests that as walking and cycling connections between the Appeal Site and the town centre are not 'suitable' that this will mean that residents will use the car. A bus service operates near to the Appeal Site and I consider it relevant to examine this service to determine if it offers an alternative form of travel to the private car for Appeal Site residents to access town centre amenities.

2.4.2 I examine this question in Chapter 7 of my evidence.

2.5 RAIL

2.5.1 Clitheroe benefits from a rail station. In Chapter 8 of my evidence, I examine:

- (i) What are the pedestrian links between the Appeal Site and Clitheroe rail station
- (ii) Which train services operate within Clitheroe?
- (iii) What is the service frequency of existing train services?
- (iv) What times do the existing train services operate?
- (v) What destinations would be available to Appeal Site residents by train travel?
- (vi) Does the Appeal scheme offer an acceptable level of connectivity by rail travel?
- (vii) Does the Appeal scheme meet NPPF public transport considerations for new residential development?

3 Policy Context

3.1 REASON FOR REFUSAL

3.1.1 The RVBC reasons for refusal makes reference to the following policy documents:

- (i) Ribble Valley Core Strategy,
- (ii) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3.2 RIBBLE VALLEY BC: CORE STRATEGY 2008-2028

3.2.1 The RVBC reasons for refusal make reference to the following Key Statements and Policies of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy:

- (i) Key Statement DS2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development,
- (ii) Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations,
- (iii) Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations,
- (iv) Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility.

3.2.2 The RVBC Core Strategy was adopted on 14 December 2014. The Core Strategy is the central document to the Local Development Framework and establishes the vision, underlying objectives and key principles that the Council will follow to guide development in the Borough. Although it is used to aid the assessment of planning applications its primary function is to set a more strategic level of planning policy for the area.

3.2.3 Key Statement DS2: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

3.2.3.1 Key Statement DS2 of the Council's Core Strategy states:

“KEY STATEMENT DS2: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants

jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

- *any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted."*

3.2.4 Key Statement DMI2: Transport Considerations

3.2.4.1 The Core Strategy sets out the Council's position with regard to transport in in Key Statement DMI2. This states that:

"KEY STATEMENT DMI2: TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS

New development should be located to minimise the need to travel. Also it should incorporate good access by foot and cycle and have convenient links to public transport to reduce the need for travel by private car. In general, schemes offering opportunities for more sustainable means of transport and sustainable travel improvements will be supported. Sites for potential future railway stations at Chatburn and Gisburn will be protected from inappropriate development.

Major applications should always be accompanied by a comprehensive travel plan."

3.2.5 Policy DMG2: Strategic Considerations

3.2.5.1 Policy DMG2 states that:

“Development should be in accordance with the core strategy development strategy and should support the spatial vision.

- 1. Development proposals in the principal settlements of Clitheroe, Longridge and Whalley and the tier 1 villages should consolidate, expand or round-off development so that it is closely related to the main built up areas, ensuring this is appropriate to the scale of, and in keeping with, the existing settlement.*

Within the tier 2 villages and outside the defined settlement areas development must meet at least one of the following considerations:

- 1. The development should be essential to the local economy or social well being of the area.*
- 2. The development is needed for the purposes of forestry or agriculture.*
- 3. The development is for local needs housing which meets an identified need and is secured as such.*
- 4. The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.*
- 5. The development is for small-scale uses appropriate to a rural area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*
- 6. The development is compatible with the enterprise zone designation.*

Within the open countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build.

In protecting the designated area of outstanding natural beauty the council will have regard to the economic and social well being of the area. However, the most important consideration in the assessment of any development proposals will be the

protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape and character of the area avoiding where possible habitat fragmentation. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build. Development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the AONB by virtue of its size, design, use of material, landscaping and siting. the AONB management plan should be considered and will be used by the council in determining planning applications.

For the purposes of this policy the term settlement is defined in the glossary. current settlement boundaries will be updated in subsequent DPDS."

3.2.6 Policy DMG3: Transport and Mobility

3.2.6.1 The Council's position on transport is expanded further in Policy DMG3, which states:

"POLICY DMG3: TRANSPORT AND MOBILITY

In making decisions on development proposals the local planning authority will, in addition to assessing proposals within the context of the development strategy, attach considerable weight to:

The availability and adequacy of public transport and associated infrastructure to serve those moving to and from the development –

- 1. The relationship of the site to the primary route network and the strategic road network.*
- 2. The provision made for access to the development by pedestrian, cyclists and those with reduced mobility.*
- 3. Proposals which promote development within existing developed areas or extensions to them at locations which are highly accessible by means other than the private car.*
- 4. Proposals which locate major generators of travel demand in existing centres which are highly accessible by means other than the private car.*

5. *Proposals which strengthen existing town and village centres which offer a range of everyday community shopping and employment opportunities by protecting and enhancing their vitality and viability.*
6. *Proposals which locate development in areas which maintain and improve choice for people to walk, cycle or catch public transport rather than drive between homes and facilities which they need to visit regularly.*
7. *Proposals which limit parking provision for developments and other on or off street parking provision to discourage reliance on the car for work and other journeys where there are effective alternatives.*

All major proposals should offer opportunities for increased use of, or the improved provision of, bus and rail facilities. All development proposals will be required to provide adequate car parking and servicing space in line with currently approved standards. ..."

3.3 NPPF: ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

3.3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied.

3.3.2 Paragraph 7 of NPPF sets out that:

"The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At a very high level, the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

3.3.3 In paragraph 10, NPPF makes it clear that:

*"So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development.**"*

3.4 NPPF: PROMOTING SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

3.4.1 The Government's commitment to sustainable development is emphasised in NPPF. Paragraph 102 advises development promoters to consider transport issues from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that:

- a) the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed;*
- b) opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure, and changing technology and usage, are realised – for example in relation to the scale, location or density of development that can be accommodated;*
- c) opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;*
- d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains; and*
- e) patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places."*

3.4.2 This is expanded in paragraph 103, which states:

"The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making."

The proposed development respects and reflects this NPPF transport sustainability related objective.

3.4.3 NPPF states in paragraph 108 that:

“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;*
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and*
- c) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.”*

3.4.4 NPPF makes it clear in paragraph 109 that:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.” (AHA emphasis).

3.4.5 NPPF offers specific transport advice with respect to development proposals. In paragraph 110, NPPF sets out that development should:

- “a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;*
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;*
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;*

- d) *allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and*
- e) *be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations."*

4 Existing Conditions

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 To examine the Council's reason for refusal, I consider it important to have a good understanding of the conditions that currently prevail in the vicinity of the Appeal Site. The information I have collected comprises:

- (i) Carriageway widths of local roads;
- (ii) Footway widths along routes likely to be used to access local amenities;
- (iii) Gradient of Henthorn Road between the Appeal Site and Bawdlands;
- (iv) Traffic flows along Henthorn Road;
- (v) Traffic composition along Henthorn Road;
- (vi) Traffic speeds for Henthorn Road;
- (vii) Accident records;
- (viii) Census data.

4.1.2 Figure 1 identifies the local amenities near to the Appeal Site. I have also highlighted the routes on Figure 1 that Appeal Site residents are likely to use on a regular basis to access the local amenities. The routes are:

- (i) Henthorn Road,
- (ii) Garnett Road/Lancaster Road,
- (iii) Ennerdale Road,
- (iv) Siddows Avenue,
- (v) Thorn Street/Eshton Terrace/Greenacre Street,
- (vi) Bawdlands/Parsons Lane/Moor Lane,
- (vii) Station Road (up to 2000m walk isochrone).

I have undertaken an audit of these routes.

4.2 CARRIAGEWAY WIDTHS

4.2.1 Henthorn Road

4.2.1.1 I have undertaken a geometric audit of Henthorn Road. This has involved taking a number of measurements of the Henthorn Road carriageway width. Henthorn Road is about 1.0km long between its junction with Bawdlands and the north east corner of the Appeal Site.

4.2.1.2 Figure 2 provides a summary of the existing carriageway widths and the locations at which I have taken a measurement. I have recorded the carriageway width at 25no locations along Henthorn Road, being about every 40m. I consider this to be a reasonable summary of carriageway width over the route.

4.2.1.3 Based on the carriageway measurements I have taken, I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 8.4m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 5.5m,
- (iii) Average carriageway width: 6.6m.

4.2.2 Garnett Road/Lancaster Road

4.2.2.1 I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 7.0m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 6.3m,
- (iii) Average carriageway width: 6.6m.

4.2.3 Ennerdale Road

4.2.3.1 I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 5.7m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 5.0m,

- (iii) Average carriageway width: 5.2m.

4.2.4 Siddows Avenue

4.2.4.1 I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 6.5m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 6.3m,
- (iii) Average carriageway width: 6.4m.

4.2.5 Thorn Street/Eshton Terrace/Greenacre Street

4.2.5.1 I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 8.4m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 5.8m,
- (iii) Average carriageway width: 7.3m.

4.2.6 Bawdlands/Parsons Lane/Moor Lane

4.2.6.1 I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 8.9m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 4.0m,
- (iii) Average carriageway width: 6.6m.

4.2.7 Station Road

4.2.7.1 I have established the following:

- (i) Maximum carriageway width: 10.1m,
- (ii) Minimum carriageway width: 6.5m,
- (iii) Average carriageway width: 7.6m.

4.3 FOOTWAY WIDTHS

4.3.1 I have completed an audit of footway widths along the routes set out in paragraph 4.1.2. Where applicable, I have recorded the footways widths on both sides of the road. I have recorded the width of footway at 78 locations. I consider this to provide a reasonable representation of pedestrian infrastructure near to the Appeal Site.

4.3.2 Henthorn Road

4.3.2.1 Figure 2 provides a summary of footway widths along Henthorn Road between Bawdlands and the Appeal Site. Figure 1 identifies 25no locations that I have taken measurements and I consider this to be a reasonable summary of footway widths over the route.

4.3.2.2 There is continuous footway on both the north and south sides of Henthorn Road between Blakewater Road (access to the GDL scheme permitted in 2012) and Bawdlands. Based on the measurements I have taken, I have established the following:

(i) Maximum footway width:	West = 7.2m	East = 10.0m,
(ii) Minimum footway width:	West = 1.8m	East = 1.7m,
(iii) Average footway width:	West = 2.6m	East = 2.5m.

4.3.3 Garnett Road/Lancaster Road

4.3.3.1 I have established the following:

(i) Maximum footway width:	West = 2.5m	East = 2.5m,
(ii) Minimum footway width:	West = 2.0m	East = 1.8m,
(iii) Average footway width:	West = 2.3m	East = 2.2m.

4.3.4 Ennerdale Road

4.3.4.1 I have established the following:

(i) Maximum footway width:	North = 2.0m	South = 2.0m,
----------------------------	--------------	---------------

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| (ii) Minimum footway width: | North = 2.0m | South = 1.8m, |
| (iii) Average footway width: | North = 2.0m | South = 1.9m. |

4.3.5 Siddows Avenue

4.3.5.1 I have established the following:

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| (i) Maximum footway width: | West = 2.4m | East = 2.3m, |
| (i) Minimum footway width: | West = 1.9m | East = 1.7m, |
| (i) Average footway width: | West = 2.3m | East = 2.0m. |

4.3.6 Thorn Street/Eshton Terrace/Greenacre Street

4.3.6.1 I have established the following:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| (i) Maximum footway width: | North = 1.9m | South = 2.1m, |
| (ii) Minimum footway width: | North = 1.0m | South = 1.5m, |
| (iii) Average footway width: | North = 1.7m | South = 1.8m. |

4.3.7 Bawdlands/Parsons Lane/Moor Lane

4.3.7.1 I have established the following:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| (i) Maximum footway width: | North/East = 3.7m | South/West = 4.4m, |
| (ii) Minimum footway width: | North/East = 1.2m | South/West = 1.7m, |
| (iii) Average footway width: | North/East = 1.9m | South/West = 2.1m. |

4.3.8 Station Road

4.3.8.1 I have established the following:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| (i) Maximum footway width: | West = 3.9m | East = 2.1m, |
| (ii) Minimum footway width: | West = 2.0m | East = 1.9m, |
| (iii) Average footway width: | West = 2.5m | East = 2.0m. |

4.4 VERTICAL ALIGNMENT

4.4.1 The Ordnance Survey plan that I have purchased identifies the following spot levels on Henthorn Road:

- (i) 62.5m: about 100m south-west of Kenilworth Drive,
- (ii) 74.4m: at the junction with Thorn Street.

4.4.2 I estimate the distance between the two spot measurements to be about 900m. Therefore, on average, the gradient of Henthorn Road is about 1.3%.

4.5 TRAFFIC FLOWS

4.5.1 The TA report (ref 1616/2/B, CD1.07) sets out AM & PM peak hour traffic count data for the local highway network in the vicinity of the Appeal Site.

4.5.2 A classified turning traffic count was undertaken on 5 June 2018 at the junction of Henthorn Road/Thorn Street junction, which is SJ6 of the TA study network. A review of the traffic count (refer Figure B1, Appendix B, AHA TA report 1616/2/B, CD1.07), shows that the AM and PM peak hour flows immediately to the south of the junction are:

- (i) AM: Northbound = 392 vehicles Southbound = 155 vehicles,
- (ii) PM: Northbound = 229 vehicles Southbound = 337 vehicles.

4.5.3 I have available an ATC survey for Henthorn Road. This involved the installation of pneumatic tubes on Henthorn Road, about 70m north-east of Kenilworth Drive, between 4 and 10 July 2018. The results for this survey are included in Appendix B. A review of these results identifies the following average 5-day (ie Monday-Friday) AM & PM peak hour flows:

- (i) AM: Northbound = 223 vehicles Southbound = 91 vehicles,
- (ii) PM: Northbound = 120 vehicles Southbound = 220 vehicles.

4.5.4 The highest recorded flows on Henthorn Road were recorded to the south of the Thorn Street junction (ie towards the north-east end of Henthorn Road).

4.5.5 Highway Capacity: Henthorn Road

4.5.5.1 I am satisfied that the traffic data is representative of typical flow patterns along Henthorn Road. Based on these flows, I have undertaken an assessment of the traffic capacity of Henthorn Road in the vicinity of the Henthorn Road/Thorn Street junction. The capacity assessment is undertaken in line with the DfT Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) TA 79/99 'Traffic Capacity of Urban Roads' document. The document sets out the capacity of different types of urban roads. The road assessed corresponds most closely to the UAP3 category (Table 1, TA 79/99, extract in my Appendix C). From Table 2 of TA 79/99 (also in Appendix C) the one-way hourly capacity of the roads assessed is about 1100 vehicles, (this is based on a 6.75m wide carriageway, which is the closest match to the average width of Henthorn Road). Based on this selection, the two-way hourly capacity of Henthorn Road is about 1833 vehicles.

4.5.5.2 Based on the above, the existing traffic flows expressed as a percentage of the theoretical capacity of the road are:

- (i) AM Peak Hour: 29.8%,
- (ii) PM Peak Hour: 30.9%.

This confirms that existing peak hour traffic volumes on Henthorn Road are significantly below the capacity of the road. It is worth pointing out that these relate to peak hour flows and traffic flows at other times of the day will be lower.

4.6 TRAFFIC COMPOSITION

4.6.1 I have reviewed the ATC data for Henthorn Road (Appendix B). This shows that the total percentages of HGV movements collected over the full survey period (4-10 July 2018) are:

- (i) Northbound: 1.49%
- (ii) Southbound: 0.62%

- 4.6.2 The DfT Road Use Statistics (2016) set out that the national average is 5% HGV content. Based on this, it is reasonable to conclude that the HGV content for Henthorn Road is significantly lower than the national average.

4.7 VEHICLE SPEEDS

- 4.7.1 I have available an ATC survey for Henthorn Road. This involved the installation of pneumatic tubes on Henthorn Road, about 70m north of Kenilworth Road, between 4 and 10 July 2018. The results for this survey are included in Appendix B. A review of these results identifies the following:

- (i) Northbound: Average speed = 25.3mph,
- (ii) Southbound: Average speed = 25.2mph,

The ATC data confirms that average vehicle speeds are above the 20mph speed limit but are still well below 30mph.

4.8 ACCIDENT RECORDS

- 4.8.1 I have purchased accident records from Lancashire Constabulary (LC) for study junctions SJ1-SJ12. The LC five-year accident records for the period 01.05.13 to 30.04.18 are reviewed. The LC accident data is included in Appendix D of my evidence.

4.8.2 Distribution of Accidents

- 4.8.2.1 A summary of the Lancashire Constabulary accident data is set out below:

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	TOTAL
	(from 01/05)			(to 30/04)			
Henthorn Road	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Garnett Road/Lancaster Drive	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Ennerdale Road	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Siddows Avneue	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Thorn St/Eshton T/Greenacre St	1	-	-	1	2	-	4
Bawdlands/Parsons Lane	1	1	-	1	-	-	3

TOTAL	2	1	1	2	2	0	7
-------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

It is concluded that there has only been seven accidents on roads near to the Appel Site.

4.8.3 Pedestrians

4.8.3.1 There has been no recorded accidents involving pedestrians on:

- (i) Henthorn Road,
- (ii) Garnett Road/Lancaster Drive,
- (iii) Ennerdale Road, and
- (iv) Siddows Avenue.

4.8.3.2 There have been the following accidents involving pedestrians:

- (i) Eshton Terrace/Woone Lane: Child leaves pavement to go around other pedestrians and steps into path of approaching car. Accident is defined as serious.
- (ii) Bawdlands/Pump Street: Pedestrian walking along area that leads to YMCA car park is hit by a vehicle. Vehicle fails to stop. Accident is defined as slight.
- (iii) Bawdlands/Corporation Street: Pedestrian steps of pavement into the path of a cyclist. Accident defined as serious.
- (iv) Parsons Lane: Pedestrian under the influence of alcohol fails to look before stepping into the road. Pedestrian struck by vehicle at low speed. Accident defined as slight.

4.8.4 Summary

4.8.4.1 There have been four accidents involving pedestrians. All accidents have occurred in different locations. Three of the accidents appear to involve pedestrian error. It is concluded that whilst all accidents are regrettable, there is no accident pattern that highlights safety concerns for a particular walk route or that gives rise to the need for accident remediation measures.

4.9 CENSUS DATA

4.9.1 I have reviewed 2011 Census data to establish the modal split for journey to work for:

- (i) Clitheroe residents; and
- (ii) Residents within the wider Ribble Valley borough.

4.9.2 The results of the interrogation are presented in Table 1. This shows that:

- (i) Car driver travel for Clitheroe (63.5%) is lower than across Ribble Valley borough (70.8%);
- (ii) Work at home for Clitheroe (4.0%) is lower than across Ribble Valley borough (7.9%);
- (iii) Train travel for Clitheroe (1.3%) is higher than across Ribble Valley borough (1.1%);
- (iv) Bus travel for Clitheroe (2.3%) is higher than across Ribble Valley borough (2.1%).

5 Walk

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 The RVBC reason for refusal No 1 states that:

"1. The proposed development would result in an unsustainable form of development within the countryside. Due to the site's location, with a lack of cycling or suitable pedestrian access to the town centre, future residents will be wholly reliant on the car. As such the development is contrary to Key Statements DS2 and DMI2, as well as Policies DMG2 and DMG3, of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework." (my emphasis)

Consequently, I examine the pedestrian connectivity of the Appeal development to local services in this chapter.

5.1.2 It is established and acknowledged that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level, and offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly under 2km.

5.2 WALKING STATISTICS AND GUIDANCE

5.2.1 National Travel Survey (2017)

5.2.1.1 The National Travel Survey (NTS) of 2017 provides data on walk trips. A summary of NTS 2017 is included in my Appendix E. The NTS 2017 establishes that:

- 81% of all trips under 1 mile (1.6km) are made by foot,
- The average walk trip is 17 minutes which equates to a distance of about 1.36km,
- Walking accounts for 26% of all trips and 3% of distance travelled,
- Education and Shopping trips account for 40% of all walk trips,
- 67% of people undertake a walk of 20 minutes or more at least once a week,
- The average shopping trip is 17 minutes and 27% of shopping trips are made by foot,
- The average commuting trip is 31 minutes and 11% of commuting trips are

made by foot.

Based on the average walk trip of 17 minutes, this means that the average walk trip is about 0.9 miles (circa 1.4km).

5.2.2 CIHT Providing for Journeys on Foot

5.2.2.1 Table 3.2 of the CIHT document 'Providing Journeys on Foot' (extract in my Appendix F) provides guidance about journeys on foot. It does not provide a definitive view of distances, but does suggest a preferred maximum distance of 2000m for walk commuting and school trips.

5.2.3 Manual for Streets

5.2.3.1 The 'walkable neighbourhood' concept is set out in MfS1 and endorsed in MfS2. MfS1 explains that:

"Walkable neighbourhoods are typically characterised by having a range of facilities within 10 minutes' (up to about 800 m) walking distance of residential areas which residents may access comfortably on foot. However, this is not an upper limit and walking offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly those under 2 km." (MfS1 para 4.4.1, extract in my Appendix G)

5.2.3.2 Whilst reference is made to 800m, MfS is very clear that this does not represent an upper limit. Indeed, MfS indicates that walk trips of about 2km are feasible. This is consistent with evidence collected in the NTS which confirms that average walk trips are 0.9 miles (about 1.4km), being well in excess of 800m.

5.2.3.3 Figure 6.8 of MfS (extract in my Appendix H) shows the widths of footway required to accommodate different types of user. This shows:

- | | | |
|-------|--|-----------|
| (i) | Adult with a walking stick: | 0.75m; |
| (ii) | Wheelchair user: | 0.9m, |
| (iii) | Two Adults side-by-side, one pushing a pram: | 1.5m, and |
| (iv) | Adult and child side-by-side: | 1.2m. |

5.2.4 CIHT Planning for Walking

5.2.4.1 The document (included in my Appendix I) sets out that:

“Across Britain about 80 per cent of journeys shorter than 1 mile are made wholly on foot – something that has changed little in thirty years...”

The document continues:

“For journeys that are 1 to 2 miles long, 26 per cent are made on foot (NTS 2012), more than by bus...”

5.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

5.3.1 Pedestrian Infrastructure

5.3.1.1 Figure 2 provides a summary of footway widths along routes that I consider will be used by Appeal Site residents to access local amenities.

5.3.1.2 I have recorded measurements at 78 locations in the vicinity of the Appeal Site. I have recorded the following average footway widths:

(i)	Henthorn Road:	West = 2.6m	East = 2.5m,
(ii)	Garnett Road/Lancaster Road:	West = 2.3m	East = 2.2m,
(iii)	Ennerdale Road:	North = 2.0m	South = 1.9m,
(iv)	Siddows Avenue:	West = 2.3m	East = 2.0m,
(v)	Thorn Street/Eshton Terrace/Greenacre Street:	North = 1.7m	South = 1.8m,
(vi)	Bawdlands/Parsons Lane/Moor Lane:	N/E = 1.9m	S/W = 2.1m,
(vii)	Station Road (up to 2000m walk isochrone):	West = 2.5m	East = 2.0m,

5.3.2 Public Rights of Way

5.3.2.1 Figure 3 presents the existing Public Rights of Way (PROW) near to the Appeal Site. Footpath 3-1 FP17 is aligned around the western perimeter of the Site. This provides a walking connection between Edisford Road and Henthorn Road.

5.3.2.2 Footpath 3-1 FP17 is to be upgraded using a financial contribution secured from the Story Homes development. Surface enhancements will deliver an improved footpath connection between Henthorn Road and Primrose Road.

5.3.3 Walk Isochrones and Local Amenities

5.3.3.1 It is useful to construct walk isochrones for the Appeal Site to establish the locations and amenities within the local area that could be accessible to residents of the proposed development on foot.

5.3.3.2 I consider it relevant to construct 400m, 800m, 1200m, 1600m and 2000m walk isochrones for the Appeal Site. Typical walk speeds are usually taken to be between 1.2 and 1.4m/s. Therefore, a walk distance of 400m would be completed in about 5 minutes.

5.3.3.3 Figure 1 presents the development 400m, 800m, 1200m, 1600m and 2000m walk isochrones, (ie reflecting 5, 10, 15, 20 and 25-minute walk journeys), and taking account of the existing pedestrian infrastructure and also the proposed pedestrian links between the Appeal Site and the surrounding area. Figure 1 presents local facilities within walking distance of the Site. Table 2 presents the measured walk distance between the centre of the Appeal Site and the local amenities.

5.3.3.4 The Appeal Site centroid is adopted as the average measurement to amenities for residents of the development scheme. Review of Figure 1 confirms that there are amenities within 1200m of the Appeal Site, including:

- Travel: Bus stops;
- Education: Primary school, nursery/pre-school;
- Shopping: ATM, convenience store;

- Leisure: Public open space, playground.

There are additional amenities within a 1600m walk of the Appeal Site. The vast majority of town centre amenities are located between 1600-2000m of the Site.

I consider there to be a good range of amenities within a walkable distance of the Appeal Site. The amenities cater for many of the day-to-day trip purposes such as shopping and education.

5.3.3.5 Figure 1 demonstrates that a substantial part of Clitheroe is within 1.6km of the Appeal Site. Based on the DfT National Travel Survey statistics, which confirms that the vast majority (ie 81%) of trips of up to 1.6km are on foot, there is good likelihood Appeal Site residents would wish to access local amenities on foot.

5.3.4 Walk Routes to School

5.3.4.1 The National Travel Survey (NTS) sets out that 46% of children aged 5-10 years walk to school. For journeys of under 1 mile (1.6km) 80% of children (5-10 years) walk to school.

5.3.4.2 The nearest primary school to the Site is Edisford Primary School on Edisford Road. There is a pedestrian entrance to the school at Siddows Avenue/Hargreaves Court. The walk distance between the centre of the Site and this entrance is about 1.0km, which is well below the distance quoted in NTS. Consequently, there is a reasonable expectation that most children at the Appeal Site, and based at Edisford Primary School, will walk to school.

5.3.4.3 The most likely route for residents to walk to/from Edisford Primary School is:

Henthorn Road (S) – Henthorn Road (N) – Siddows Avenue (pedestrian entrance).

5.3.4.4 The Appeal scheme will deliver new pedestrian infrastructure at the Site access and along the northwest side of Henthorn Road (S) (coincident with the Site frontage). The new footway is to be 2.0m wide and includes street lighting. Henthorn Road (S) is subject to a 20mph speed limit, which is conducive to an environment for walking.

5.3.4.5 Henthorn Road (N) is an established residential road subject to a 20mph speed limit. The route is relatively level and offers sealed surface footways on both sides and benefits from street lighting. There are residential properties fronting Henthorn Road (N), which offer a degree of neighbourhood surveillance.

5.3.4.6 Siddows Avenue is also an established residential road, about 175m long and is subject to a 20mph speed limit. The route is relatively level, offers sealed surface footways on both sides of the road and benefits from street lighting. There are residential properties fronting Siddows Avenue which offer a degree of neighbourhood surveillance.

5.3.5 Accident History

5.3.5.1 The most recent 5-year accident data from Lancashire Constabulary (Appendix D) confirms that there have been no recorded accidents involving pedestrians on:

- (i) Henthorn Road,
- (ii) Garnett Road/Lancaster Drive,
- (iii) Ennerdale Road, and
- (iv) Siddows Avenue.

This is significant as Henthorn Road is likely to be the most popular walk route for Appeal Site residents. The route along Henthorn Road between the Appeal Site and Bawdlands is about 1400m and represents about 75% of the walk route between the Appeal Site and the town centre. The walk routes along Garnett Road/Lancaster Road, Ennerdale Road and Siddows Avenue would be used by children at the Appeal Site walking to/from Edisford Primary School.

5.3.5.2 There have been four accidents involving pedestrians on Eshton Terrace, Bawlands and Parsons Lane. All accidents have occurred in different locations. Three of the accidents appear to involve pedestrian error. It is concluded that there is no accident pattern that raises safety concerns for a particular walk route. LCC did not raise concerns about local pedestrian infrastructure in their consultation response.

5.4 SUITABILITY OF EXISTING PEDESTRIAN INFRASTRUCTURE

5.4.1 I have completed an audit of the walk routes, near to the Appeal Site, that I consider will be used on a regular basis by residents of the Appeal scheme. The total length of routes that I have considered is about 3.2km. I have taken measurements at 78 locations. The results of my audit are shown on Figure 2. I consider the measurements on Figure 2 to be a reasonable representation of existing footway provision.

5.4.2 Footway Widths

5.4.2.1 Figure 2 shows that footway measurements are consistently about 1.7-2.2m. This means that the reporting of an average measurement is a reasonable indicator of existing provision.

5.4.2.2 The typical footway width of 1.7-2.2m is in excess of all of the footway widths shown on Figure 6.8 of MfS (extract in Appendix H). This means that all of the user groups identified in Figure 6.8 of MfS can be comfortably accommodated by the existing footway provision.

5.4.3 Walking Environment

5.4.3.1 All of the walk routes identified on Figure 2 are along roads subject to a 20mph speed limit. This helps to reduce the dominance of motor vehicles and fosters a better environment for walking.

5.4.4 Footway Surface and Lighting

5.4.4.1 All of the walk routes identified on Figure 2 offer sealed footway surface and the routes benefit from street lighting.

5.4.5 Frontage Surveillance

5.4.5.1 All of the walk routes identified on Figure 2 are fronted by either residential or commercial property. This offers a degree of neighbourhood surveillance which can be helpful for vulnerable pedestrians, such as children.

5.4.6 Gradient

5.4.6.1 All of the walk routes identified on Figure 2 offer a relatively level topography, with the single exception of Moor Lane. Therefore, I am satisfied that excessive gradient does not act as an obstacle to walk trips for Appeal Site residents.

5.4.7 Summary

5.4.7.1 I am satisfied that the routes likely to be used by Appeal Site residents on a regular basis offer a very good level of pedestrian infrastructure. In reaching this view, I have taken into account:

- (i) Footway widths,
- (ii) Speed limit of the adjoining carriageway,
- (iii) Surface and lighting,
- (iv) Frontage surveillance, and
- (v) Topography.

5.5 LCC & PLANNING INSPECTORATE

5.5.1 LCC Position

5.5.1.1 The LCC Consultation Response (5 October 2018, Appendix J) states:

"...the proposed development lies at the extreme of acceptable walking distances for pedestrian trips to local amenities".

The LCC response confirms that walking is a viable option for residents of the proposed development and LCC find no basis to object to the proposal on the grounds of accessibility.

5.5.2 Planning Inspectorate

5.5.2.1 It is relevant to compare the Appeal Site with another GDL site located immediately to the north. This scheme of 270 dwellings was granted planning consent following an Appeal (ref: APP/T2350/A/11/2161186).

5.5.2.2 Paragraph 33 of the Inspector's Appeal Decision states:

"The Council's main concern relates to pedestrian accessibility. To that end reliance is placed upon the IHT walk distance guidance. The IHT guidance does not provide a definitive view of distances, but does suggest a preferred maximum distance of 2,000m for commuting or school trips. In my view a degree of realism must be applied. Most journeys of less than a mile are undertaken on foot which would take a future resident close to the town centre. The Appeal proposals plainly are such that pedestrians have a realistic choice of alternative modes of travel including the private car. It is a fact that some of the facilities lie beyond 800m, but from the walk isochrones and local amenities plan it is clear to me that there are a range of facilities within an easy walk of the Appeal Site. In particular the northern access, linking to the Caravan Road and then to Edisford Road, would take a future resident to the Leisure Centre, the primary school and the local convenience store (Spar)."

5.5.2.3 Paragraph 35 of the Inspector's Appeal Decision concludes:

"The site is sufficiently accessible with the measures proposed by the Appellant. The proposal would not conflict with national policy, the aforementioned RSS policies or Policy T1 of the RVDWLP. Overall I conclude on the first issue that the Appeal proposal would comprise a sustainable form of development".

5.6 COMPARISON OF GDL SCHEME FOR 270 DWELLINGS WITH CURRENT APPEAL SCHEME

5.6.1 The Appeal scheme is located immediately south-west of another GDL residential scheme (for 270 dwellings) which was subject to an appeal in 2012 (APP/T2350/A/11/2161186). It is relevant to compare walk distances to local amenities for the permitted GDL scheme with the current Appeal scheme.

- 5.6.2 I consider the junction of Croal Road/Blakewater Road to be reasonably representative of the centre of the permitted GDL scheme. All residents of the permitted GDL scheme must use Blakewater Road to walk to and from amenities. I estimate the walk distance between the Croal Road/Blakewater Road junction to the Blakewater Road/Henthorn Road junction (ie along Blakewater Road) to be about 300m. The corresponding walk distance from the centre of the Appeal Site to the junction of Blakewater Road/Henthorn Road is about 250m. Therefore, on average, residents of the Appeal scheme would have a shorter walk distance (by about 50m) to local amenities as compared to residents of the permitted GDL scheme.
- 5.6.3 The inspector for the permitted GDL scheme concludes in paragraph 33 that residents of the scheme have a "range of facilities within an easy walk". As the Appeal scheme is closer to local amenities it must follow that the residents of the Appeal scheme would also enjoy a "range of facilities within an easy walk".
- 5.7 SUMMARY
- 5.7.1 I have completed an audit of local amenities proximate to the Appeal Site. I have demonstrated that there are a wide range of facilities within a distance of 1.6km. The National Travel Survey confirms that 81% of all trips of 1 mile (1.6km) or less are completed on foot. Given this, it is reasonable to conclude that Site resident trips to local amenities are highly likely to be undertaken on foot.
- 5.7.2 I have identified the routes that Appeal Site residents are likely to use on a regular basis to access local amenities. I have completed an audit of these routes. I have demonstrated that the vast majority of the walking routes offer footway provision that will comfortably accommodate all user groups, including those with either temporary or permanent mobility impairment. All of the routes are adjacent to roads to subject to a 20mph speed limit, which helps to foster an environment conducive to walking. All of the routes are relatively level (except for Moor Lane), offer a good level of surface construction and benefit from lighting. I am satisfied that the existing pedestrian infrastructure is of a high standard and will encourage walking rather than act as a deterrent.

5.7.3 I have compared the Appeal Site to another GDL residential scheme (for 270 dwellings) which was subject to an appeal in 2012 (APP/T2350/A/11/2161186). I am satisfied that residents of the Appeal scheme would have a shorter walk distance (by about 50m) to local amenities as compared to residents of the permitted GDL scheme. The inspector for the permitted GDL scheme concluded that residents of the that scheme have a "range of facilities within an easy walk" and it should follow that the same conclusion should be reached for the current Appeal scheme.

6 Cycle

6.1 INTRODUCTION

6.1.1 The RVBC reason for refusal No 1 states that:

"1. The proposed development would result in an unsustainable form of development within the countryside. Due to the site's location, with a lack of cycling or suitable pedestrian access to the town centre, future residents will be wholly reliant on the car. As such the development is contrary to Key Statements DS2 and DMI2, as well as Policies DMG2 and DMG3, of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework." (my emphasis)

6.2 CYCLING STATISTICS AND GUIDANCE

6.2.1 CIHT Cycle Friendly Infrastructure

6.2.1.1 The CIHT guidance 'Cycle Friendly Infrastructure' (2004) states that:

"Most journeys are short. Three quarters of journeys by all modes are less than five miles (8km) and half under two miles (3.2km) (DOT 1993, table 2a). These are distances that can be cycled comfortably by a reasonably fit person." (para 2.3).

6.2.2 National Travel Survey (2017)

6.2.2.1 The NTS 2017 (refer Appendix E) also provides data on cycle trips and establishes that:

- (i) On average, people complete 17 cycle trips per year,
- (ii) 2% of all trips are completed by cycle,
- (iii) The average cycle trip was 23 minutes,
- (iv) Education, shopping and commuting accounted for 9%, 11% and 34% of cycle trips.

Based on an average cycle trip of 23 minutes, this would equate to a cycle distance of just under 5km.

6.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

6.3.1 Henthorn Road

6.3.1.1 Based on recorded traffic count data, I have demonstrated that the existing traffic movements account for only about 30% of the theoretical capacity of Henthorn Road. This confirms that Henthorn Road is not a car dominated corridor.

6.3.1.2 I have available an ATC survey for Henthorn Road, at a location about 70m north of Kenilworth Road. This recorded the following speeds:

- (i) Northbound: Average speed = 25.3mph,
- (ii) Southbound: Average speed = 25.2mph,

The ATC data confirms that average vehicle speeds are above the 20mph speed limit but are still well below 30mph.

6.3.1.3 The ATC data confirms that Henthorn Road does not carry a high level of HGV traffic.

6.3.1.4 I have reviewed spot level information for Henthorn Road. This confirms that the average gradient along Henthorn Road is about 1.3%.

6.3.1.5 Taking into account traffic flows, speeds, traffic composition and gradient, I am satisfied that Henthorn Road offers a good route for cycling.

6.3.2 Cycle Isochrones and Local Amenities

6.3.2.1 It is useful to construct walk isochrones for the Appeal Site to establish the locations and amenities within the local area that could be accessible to residents of the proposed development on foot.

6.3.2.2 Figure 4 indicates the 2km and 5km cycle isochrones for the Site, reflecting typically 10-minute and 25-minute journeys. Review of Figure 4 highlights that most of Clitheroe is within a 2km cycle ride and all of Clitheroe is within a 5km cycle ride of the Site.

6.3.3 Cycle Routes to School

6.3.3.1 The nearest primary school is Edisford primary School. There is an entrance to the school at the northern end of Siddows Avenue. The most likely route for residents to cycle to/from Edisford Primary School is:

Henthorn Road (S) – Henthorn Road (N) – Siddows Avenue.

All of the route is along residential roads that are subject to a 20mph speed limit. The route is relatively level and benefits from street lighting. It is considered that development generated trips to/from school by cycle are feasible.

6.4 SUITABILITY OF LOCAL ROADS TO ACCOMMODATE CYCLE TRIPS

6.4.1 There is no dedicated cycle infrastructure (eg cycle paths, on-carriageway cycle lanes) near to the Appeal Site. Therefore, cycle trips will be accommodated on the carriageways. I have completed an audit of the cycle routes likely to be used by residents to access local facilities. The results of the audit are shown on Figure 2.

6.4.2 Carriageway Widths

6.4.2.1 Based on my audit of local roads, I have recorded the following average carriageway widths:

(i)	Henthorn Road:	6.6m,
(ii)	Garnett Road/Lancaster Road:	6.6m,
(iii)	Ennerdale Road:	5.2m,
(iv)	Siddows Avenue:	6.4m,
(v)	Thorn Street/Eshton Terrace/Greenacre Street:	7.3m,
(vi)	Bawdlands/Parsons Lane/Moor Lane:	6.6m,
(vii)	Station Road (up to 2000m walk isochrone):	7.6m.

6.4.3 Cycling Environment

6.4.3.1 All of the routes identified on Figure 2 are along roads subject to a 20mph speed limit. This helps to reduce the dominance of motor vehicles and fosters a better environment for cycling. All of the routes benefit from street lighting.

6.4.4 Gradient

6.4.4.1 All of the routes identified on Figure 2 offer a relatively level topography, with the single exception of Moor Lane. Therefore, I am satisfied that excessive gradient would not act as a deterrent to cycling.

6.4.5 Summary

6.4.5.1 I am satisfied that the routes likely to be used by Appeal Site residents on a regular basis are conducive to cycling. In reaching this view, I have taken into account:

- (i) Carriageway widths,
- (ii) Speed limit of the route,
- (iii) Topography and lighting.

6.5 SUMMARY

6.5.1 There is no dedicated cycle infrastructure near to the Appeal Site. All cycle trips will involve Henthorn Road. The route from the Appeal Site to the junction of Henthorn Road/Bawdlands is about 1400m. This is about three-quarters of the journey between the Appeal Site and the town centre.

6.5.2 It is important to consider traffic flows along Henthorn Road as high levels of traffic can act as a deterrent to cycle use, particularly occasional users or those with less confidence. I have demonstrated that, even during the busiest times of the day, the traffic flows along Henthorn Road represent only about 30% of the theoretical capacity of the road. This confirms that Henthorn Road is not a car-dominated corridor and this is conducive to cycle use.

- 6.5.3 Henthorn Road is subject to a 20mph speed limit. I have undertaken a speed survey of Henthorn Road. While this shows that average speeds are about 25mph they are still well below 30mph. Again, I consider this to offer positive encouragement to cyclists.
- 6.5.4 I have measured the Henthorn Road carriageway at 25 locations. I estimate that the average carriageway width to be 6.6m. This width can comfortably accommodate a cyclist and vehicle travelling in opposite directions or in the same direction completing an over-taking manoeuvre.
- 6.5.5 I estimate that Henthorn Road has a gradient from south to north of only 1.3%. This is a gentle incline that can easily be negotiated by cyclists. The route also benefits from street lighting.
- 6.5.6 Taking into account all of the above, I consider that cycle travel between the Appeal Site and local amenities, including those in the town centre, is a viable alternative to the private car. Consequently, I do not agree with the Council's reason for refusal.

7 Bus Travel

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 RVBC reason for refusal No1 suggests that as walking and cycling connections between the Appeal Site and the town centre are not suitable that this will mean that residents will use the car. A bus service operates near to the Appeal Site and I consider it relevant to examine this service to determine if it offers an alternative form of travel to the private car for Appeal Site residents to access town centre amenities.

7.2 BUS STATISTICS

7.2.1 National Travel Survey (2017)

7.2.1.1 The NTS 2017 (refer Appendix E) sets out that, on average, people:

- (i) undertake 56 bus trips per year,
- (ii) travel a total of 315 miles per year by bus,
- (iii) spend 38 minutes per bus trip,

The NTS 2017 confirms that 6% of all trips are carried out by bus and a quarter of the population use a bus at least once a week.

7.2.2 2011 Census

7.2.2.1 Table 1 sets out the modal split for journeys to work for Clitheroe residents and residents within the wider Ribble Valley Borough. This is derived from 2011 Census data. This confirms that bus travel accounts for 2.3% of commuter trips completed by Clitheroe residents. Across the Borough, bus travel accounts for 2.1% of work trips.

7.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

7.3.1 Existing Bus Stops & Routes

7.3.1.1 There is a frequent bus service operating near to the Appeal Site. Service No 2 calls at a stop 325m of the Appeal Site and functions as a town circular service via Low Moor. The bus service operates on a 30-minute frequency, Monday to Saturday daytime. The route of Service No 2 is shown on Figure 5.

7.3.2 Financial Support

7.3.2.1 The No 2 service is currently assisted by a financial contribution, secured through a S106 agreement, from the GDL scheme for 270 dwellings. This made the following commitments:

- (i) Full funding of the C1 bus service (or its successor) for a period of five years;
- (ii) Route must include the development site and complete stops in Clitheroe town centre including a stop at the railway station;
- (iii) Frequency will be 30 minutes at peak times;
- (iv) Bus service must be operating prior to the occupation of the 51st dwelling;
- (v) 100% of the farebox revenue to be placed in a ring-fenced fund and retained solely for the purpose of providing further funding for the bus service to continue to operate when the five years' funding provided by the appellant ends;
- (vi) Bus stop will be provided prior to the commencement of the service.

7.3.3 School Services

7.3.3.1 There is a school bus service (No 686) which calls within 800m of the Appeal Site at bus stops on Garnett Road. This service offers trips to/from Bowland County High School on school days only.

7.3.3.2 There are also school bus services which call at stops within 1200m of the Appeal Site (a 15-minute walk), on Edisford Road. Service Nos 510 and 645 offer trips to/from Clitheroe Royal Grammar School, Bowland County High School and Ribblesdale High School.

7.3.3.3 Figure 1 identifies the locations of existing bus stops in the vicinity of the Site. There is a bus stop located on Blakewater Road, opposite Lune Road, which is approximately 325m from the centre of the Appeal Site. This stop caters for journeys to Clitheroe (Service No 2).

7.3.3.4 The bus stop on Garnett Road comprises flag and pole and timetable information. This stop caters for service no 2 and school bus service No 686.

7.3.4 Bus Services & Frequencies

7.3.4.1 Table 3 summarises the scheduled bus services operating near to the Appeal Site and the frequency of service.

7.3.4.2 The existing bus services summarised in Table 3 offer travel to Clitheroe Rail Station and town centre, as well as other settlements within Clitheroe.

7.3.4.3 The first and last buses to/from Clitheroe are:

SERVICE	TO CLITHEROE		FROM CLITHEROE	
	FIRST	LAST	FIRST	LAST
2	0727	1827	0715	1815

7.3.4.4 This service coincide with typical workplace start and finish times. This means that residents of the Appeal Site have genuine opportunity to complete commuting journeys to/from Clitheroe by bus.

7.3.4.5 Typical bus journey times are:

SERVICE	DESTINATION	JOURNEY TIMES (mins)
2	Low Moor	6
	Clitheroe (Interchange- Near Rail Station)	12

7.3.4.6 It is concluded that the proposed development is accessible by bus.

7.4 PROPOSED FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

7.4.1 The appellant has agreed to provide a financial contribution, secured through a S106 agreement, of £200,000 to promote local public transport. This equates to £40,000 per annum for 5 years. This could help to secure the operation of the No 2 service from 2021 to 2026.

7.4.2 It is understood that the No 2 Clitheroe Town Circular service commenced on 5 December 2016. Therefore, it is assumed that the service has funding to operate until at least the end of year 2021. This would be extended to at least 2026 with the financial contribution secured from the Appeal scheme. In reality, the operation of the No 2 service could be extended beyond year 2026 with additional monies collected through the farebox.

7.4.3 It is reasonable to assume that the No 2 Service could remain financially viable, through a combination of existing and proposed contributions, to at least year 2026. This will mean that the service will have been assisted for a period of at least 10 years. This is greater length of assistance than many pump-primed bus services. It also worth bearing in mind that the C2 service replaced the C1, which was in operation for some time before the introduction of the C2 service. Therefore, there is a history of a bus service operating in the Henthorn Road area. This, and the appellant's commitment to a Travel Plan, means that there is good expectation that public transport 'habits' will be instilled in future residents and that the service can be sustained on a commercial basis beyond year 2026.

7.5 LCC & PLANNING INSPECTORATE

7.5.1 LCC Position

7.5.1.1 The LCC Consultation Response (5 October 2018, Appendix J) confirms that:

"Accessibility to public transport is good..."

This will be further improved by the public transport financial contribution.

7.5.2 Planning Inspectorate

7.5.2.1 The inspector for the GDL scheme for 270 dwellings (ref: APP/T2350/A/11/2161186) commented on the revised bus service in para 32 of the Appeal Decision, which states:

"Furthermore, it is part of the Appeal proposals that the existing public transport facilities would be enhanced by the introduction of a new 'quality' bus stop within the Appeal Site and the rerouting of the existing service C1 to call at this new bus stop. This would be in accordance with the aims and objectives of current national and local policies. A residential Travel Plan is also proposed to raise awareness. The enhanced bus service would mean that the journey time to the town centre and the railway station is very short. Whilst there have been criticisms of some elements of the bus service, such as how much longer beyond the 5 year period would hypothecated fares fund the service, the reality is that bus accessibility would be good." (my emphasis).

7.6 SUMMARY

7.6.1 Service No 2 operates near to the Appeal Site. The service calls at a stop at Blakewater Road/Lune Road within the adjacent residential development. The walk distance between the centre of the Appeal Site and the bus stop is 325m.

- 7.6.2 Service No 2 operates on a half-hourly frequency. The journey time to the centre of Clitheroe is only 12 minutes. The service calls at a stop near to Clitheroe Rail Station which would allow a resident to complete a longer distance trip by bus and rail. Service No 2 times of operation coincides with typical workplace start and finish times providing Appeal Site with genuine opportunity to complete commuting journeys to/from Clitheroe by bus.
- 7.6.3 Service No 2 already benefits from financial assistance which will secure its operation until at least year 2021. The appellant has agreed a financial contribution, which would secure its continued use for a further 5 years. Therefore, Service No 2 will operate to at least year 2026. This will mean that the service will have been assisted for a period of at least 10 years. This is greater length of assistance than many pump-primed bus services. This, and the appellant's commitment to a Travel Plan, means that there is good expectation that public transport 'habits' will be instilled in future residents and that the service can be sustained on a commercial basis beyond year 2026.
- 7.6.4 Both LCC highways officers and the inspector for for the GDL scheme for 270 dwellings (ref: APP/T2350/A/11/2161186) conclude that bus accessibility is good. I concur with this view and consider that the service offers a genuine travel option to access town centre facilities. Consequently, I do not agree with the RVBC assertion, in their reason for refusal, that future residents would be wholly reliant on the private car for trips to/from town centre facilities.

8 Rail Travel

8.1 INTRODUCTION

8.1.1 Clitheroe benefits from a rail station. I consider it relevant to examine rail services to determine if rail travel offers an alternative form of travel to the private car for Appeal Site residents.

8.2 RAIL STATISTICS

8.2.1 National Travel Survey

8.2.1.1 The NTS 2017 (Appendix E) sets out that, on average, people:

- (i) undertake 21 train trips per year,
- (ii) travel a total of 558 miles per year by train,
- (iii) spend 79 minutes per train trip.

8.2.2 2011 Census

8.2.2.1 Table 1 sets out the modal split for journeys to work for Clitheroe residents and residents within the wider Ribble Valley Borough. This is derived from 2011 Census data. This confirms that rail travel accounts for 1.3% of commuter trips completed by Clitheroe residents. Across the Borough, bus travel accounts for 1.1% of work trips.

8.3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

8.3.1 Clitheroe Rail Station

8.3.1.1 The nearest rail station is at Clitheroe and is less than a 2km walk from the proposed development. Journeys to the rail station can also be made by cycle and bus. There are 5no cycle lockers available at the station.

8.3.2 Bus – Train Connectivity

8.3.2.1 Bus service No 2 that calls circa 325m from the Appeal Site, is routed near to Clitheroe Rail Station and the journey is about 12 minutes.

8.3.3 Rail Service & Frequencies

8.3.3.1 There is an hourly train service from Clitheroe to destinations including Blackburn, Bolton and Manchester. The journey times for services calling at Clitheroe Rail Station to a range of destinations are as follows;

DESTINATION	JOURNEY TIMES (mins)
Blackburn	22
Bolton	52
Salford Crescent	67
Manchester Victoria	76.

8.3.3.2 The NTS 2017 confirms that the average journey time for rail travel is 79 minutes. All of above journeys are less than the national average. This confirms that there is genuine opportunity for residents of the Appeal Site to make journeys to work by rail to key employment locations.

8.4 SUMMARY

8.4.1 Clitheroe Rail Station is about a 25-minute walk from the Appeal Site. I have set out that there is good footway provision between the Appeal Site and the rail station. There is opportunity to cycle between the Appeal Site and the rail station. About half of the cycle journey is along Henthorn Road. I have demonstrated that, even during the peak hours, the traffic flows along this route are only about 30% of its theoretical capacity. This combined with a 20mph speed limit and shallow gradient make it a suitable route for cycling.

8.4.2 Bus Service No 2 calls at a stop 325m from the Appeal Site. Service No 2 operates every half hour and calls at a stop near Clitheroe Rail Station. The bus journey is only 12 minutes. I consider that the combination of a bus/rail journey is viable.

- 8.4.3 Rail services calling at Clitheroe Station offer a genuine travel option to Blackburn, Bolton, Salford and Manchester. I am satisfied that a resident of the Appeal Site would not be restricted to the private car to complete longer journeys.

9 Summary and Conclusions

- 9.1 I am appointed by Gladman Developments Ltd for the Appeal against the refusal of planning permission by the planning authority Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) of the residential development proposed in the planning application ref 3/2018/0688. The Appeal development is on land off Henthorn Road, Clitheroe.
- 9.2 WALKING
- 9.2.1 I have completed an audit of local amenities proximate to the Appeal Site. I have demonstrated that there are a wide range of facilities within a distance of 1.6km. The National Travel Survey confirms that 81% of all trips of 1 mile (1.6km) or less are completed on foot. Given this, it is reasonable to conclude that Site resident trips to local amenities are highly likely to be undertaken on foot.
- 9.2.2 I have identified the routes that Appeal Site residents are likely to use on a regular basis to access local amenities. I have completed an audit of these routes. I have demonstrated that the vast majority of the walking routes offer footway provision that will comfortably accommodate all user groups, including those with either temporary or permanent mobility impairment. All of the routes are adjacent to roads subject to a 20mph speed limit, which helps to foster an environment conducive to walking. All of the routes are relatively level (except for Moor Lane), offer a good level of surface construction and benefit from lighting. I am satisfied that the existing pedestrian infrastructure is of a high standard and will encourage walking rather than act as a deterrent.
- 9.2.3 I have compared the Appeal Site to another GDL residential scheme (for 270 dwellings) which was subject to an appeal in 2012 (APP/T2350/A/11/2161186). I am satisfied that residents of the Appeal scheme would have a shorter walk distance (by about 50m) to local amenities as compared to residents of the permitted GDL scheme. The inspector for the permitted GDL scheme concluded that residents of the that scheme have a "range of facilities within an easy walk" and it should follow that the same conclusion should be reached for the current Appeal scheme.

9.2.4 I do not agree with the RVBC reason for refusal and consider that there is genuine opportunity for residents based at the Appeal Site to access local amenities on foot.

9.3 CYCLING

9.3.1 There is no dedicated cycle infrastructure near to the Appeal Site. All cycle trips will involve Henthorn Road. The route from the Appeal Site to the junction of Henthorn Road/Bawdlands is about 1400m. This is about three-quarters of the journey between the Appeal Site and the town centre.

9.3.2 It is important to consider traffic flows along Henthorn Road as high levels of traffic can act as a deterrent to cycle use, particularly occasional users or those with less confidence. I have demonstrated that, even during the busiest times of the day, the traffic flows along Henthorn Road represent only about 30% of the theoretical capacity of the road. This confirms that Henthorn Road is not a car-dominated corridor and this is conducive to cycle use.

9.3.3 Henthorn Road is subject to a 20mph speed limit. I have undertaken a speed survey of Henthorn Road. While this shows that average speeds are about 25mph they are still well below 30mph. Again, I consider this to offer positive encouragement to cyclists.

9.3.4 I have measured the Henthorn Road carriageway at 25 locations. I estimate that the average carriageway width to be 6.6m. This width can comfortably accommodate a cyclist and vehicle travelling in opposite directions or in the same direction completing an over-taking manoeuvre.

9.3.5 I estimate that Henthorn Road has a gradient from south to north of only 1.3%. This is a gentle incline that can easily be negotiated by cyclists. The route also benefits from street lighting.

9.3.6 Taking into account all of the above, I consider that cycle travel between the Appeal Site and local amenities, including those in the town centre, is a viable alternative to the private car. Consequently, I do not agree with the Council's reason for refusal.

9.4 BUSES

9.4.1 Service No 2 operates near to the Appeal Site. The service calls at a stop at Blakewater Road/Lune Road within the adjacent residential development. The walk distance between the centre of the Appeal Site and the bus stop is 325m.

9.4.2 Service No 2 operates on a half-hourly frequency. The journey time to the centre of Clitheroe is only 12 minutes. The service calls at a stop near to Clitheroe Rail Station which would allow a resident to complete a longer distance trip by bus and rail. Service No 2 times of operation coincides with typical workplace start and finish times providing Appeal Site with genuine opportunity to complete commuting journeys to/from Clitheroe by bus.

9.4.3 Service No 2 already benefits from financial assistance which will secure its operation until at least year 2021. The appellant has agreed a financial contribution, which would secure its continued use for a further 5 years. Therefore, Service No 2 will operate to at least year 2026. This will mean that the service will have been assisted for a period of at least 10 years. This is greater length of assistance than many pump-primed bus services. This, and the appellant's commitment to a Travel Plan, means that there is good expectation that public transport 'habits' will be instilled in future residents and that the service can be sustained on a commercial basis beyond year 2026.

9.4.4 Both LCC highways officers and the inspector for for the GDL scheme for 270 dwellings (ref: APP/T2350/A/11/2161186) concluded that bus accessibility is good. I concur with this view and consider that the service offers a genuine travel option to access town centre facilities. Consequently, I do not agree with the RVBC assertion, in their reason for refusal, that future residents would be wholly reliant on the private car to access town centre facilities.

9.5 RAIL

9.5.1 Clitheroe Rail Station is about a 25-minute walk from the Appeal Site. I have set out that there is good footway provision between the Appeal Site and the rail station. There is opportunity to cycle between the Appeal Site and the rail station. About half

of the cycle journey is along Henthorn Road. I have demonstrated that, even during the peak hours, the traffic flows along this route are only about 30% of its theoretical capacity. This combined with a 20mph speed limit and shallow gradient make it a suitable route for cycling.

9.5.2 Bus Service No 2 calls at a stop 325m from the Appeal Site. Service No 2 operates every half hour and calls at a stop near Clitheroe Rail Station. The bus journey is only 12 minutes. I consider that the combination of a bus/rail journey is viable.

9.5.3 Rail services calling at Clitheroe Station offer a genuine travel option to Blackburn, Bolton, Salford and Manchester. I am satisfied that a resident of the Appeal Site would not be restricted to the private car to complete longer journeys.

9.6 SUMMARY

9.6.1 Taking account of the above, I am satisfied that the appeal development is an accessible site and that residents will have opportunity to undertake walk, cycle and public transport trips. I conclude that there is no basis of support for the Council's assertion that there is inadequate accessibility by non-car borne modes of transport and that the development is not sustainable.

9.6.2 I can find no highway or transport residual impact that could reasonably be described as severe, which is the test set out in NPPF. Consequently, I am satisfied that the appeal development is acceptable on highways/transport grounds and there is no justifiable reason why planning permission should not be granted.

ashleyhelme
associates

76 washway road
sale, manchester, m33 7re
tel 0161 972 0552
fax 0161 972 0553

