



## Memorandum

---

**To** Steven McCoombe

---

**From** [REDACTED]

---

**Date** 30 April 2025

---

**Subject** 142311/FO/2025

**Erection of up to 66 no. dwellings (53 no. dwellinghouses and 13 no. apartments - Class C3) with associated access, car parking, infrastructure and landscaping**

---

We have reviewed the above application in relation to highways and our comments are as follows:

### CONTEXT

The site is located adjacent to the adopted highway of Mauldeth Road to the south and Kingsway to the west.

A 20mph speed limit is in place along Mauldeth Road. No Waiting at Any Time is in place along Mauldeth Road north and Limited Waiting Bays (3 Hours, No Return within 1 Hour, Mon - Sat 8am - 6pm) along Mauldeth Road south.

### HIGHWAYS RESPONSE

#### TRIP GENERATION AND JUNCTION CAPACITY:

##### Traffic Flows:

- o Existing traffic flows assessed via classified turning counts.
- o Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive junction assessed.
- o 28th June 2023 between 7:00 - 10:00 and 16:00 - 19:00.
- o Morning peak found to be 08:30 - 09:30 and evening peak found to be 16:45 - 17:45.
- o The junction shows that the junction is operating with spare capacity.
- o Any queuing was shown not to extend to the proposed site.

- o The parking area to the south of the site was shown to be well used and double yellow lines were adhered to.
- o Surveys found that on-street parking takes place along Mauldeth Road to the east of the site and is assumed to be associated with residents with properties fronting on Mauldeth Road.

#### Traffic Speeds:

- o As agreed with MCC a speed survey was undertaken along Mauldeth Road.
- o Survey done on Wednesday 20th July 2024.
- o 85th percentile found to be between 25mph - 28mph in both directions.

#### Trip Generation:

- o TRICS assessment undertaken for 'Houses Privately Owned' and 'Flats Privately Owned'.
- o Typical network peak hours used (08:00 - 09:00 and 17:00 - 18:00), but considered robust assessment as these rates are higher than those derived from the observed peak hours.
- o Modal share percentages applied from Local Census Journey to Work data (52.7% car driver, motorcycle, taxi and 5.8% passenger in car or van).
- o Results:
- o 38 two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak and 32 two-way trips in the PM peak.

#### Distribution & Assignment:

- o 2011 Census Journey to Work Data and observed turning proportions at Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive used to distribute the anticipated traffic movements.
- o 72% of trips assigned to west
- o 28% assigned to east
- o This is comparable to the observed turning proportions at Avonlea Drive.
- o No committed development in the area - acceptable to Highways

#### Traffic Growth:

- o .
- o 2029 TEMPRO growth factor used - acceptable to Highways

#### Operational Assessment:

- o Junctions 9 assessment carried out at proposed site access / Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive junction.
- o Maximum RFC value would be 0.073 during weekday morning peak and 0.037 during weekday evening peak.

Shows RFC levels are significantly below the design capacity of a junction.

- o Overall assessment methodology acceptable to Highways.
- o Overall results are not considered to be significant and therefore development not considered to have a detrimental impact on the highway network.

#### Wider Traffic Impact:

- o The proposed development would increase traffic flows at the A34 Kingsway / Mauldeth Road junction by 27 vehicles during the weekday peak and 22 vehicles during PM peak (one additional vehicle every two minutes).
- o To the east proposed development would increase traffic along Mauldeth Road by 11 vehicles in AM peak and 10 vehicles in PM peak (one additional vehicle every 6 minutes).
- o Proposals not are not considered to be significant and therefore development not considered to have a detrimental impact on the highway network.

#### HIGHWAYS SAFETY:

- o No incidents recorded along the site frontage.
- o 3 incidents recorded along Mauldeth Road.
- o All recorded as slight incidents and did not involve and pedestrian or cyclist.
- o 8 incidents recorded at A34 Kingsway / Mauldeth Road junction.
- o 7 incidents were slight and 1 serious.
- o The serious incident did not involve a pedestrian or cyclist.
- o The 7 slight incidents did not involve a pedestrian or cyclist.

#### SITE ACCESSIBILITY:

- o The site is well accessed by sustainable modes.
- o Regular bus services and railway services are available within walking distance of the development site.

#### PARKING AND ACCESS:

##### Access:

- o 64 of the 66 dwellings will be accessed via Mauldeth Road.
  - o New access proposed and will form a crossroad arrangement with the site access / Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive.
  - o 5.5m wide carriageway, 6m radii and 1.8m footways on both sides of the new carriageway.
- Request that footways are 2m in width to link to the existing network and ensure sufficient space for double buggies and wheelchairs.
- o Dropped kerb and tactile paving in place across the new access. Acceptable in principle.
  - o Drawing 'Figure 5.1 - Visibility Splays at Proposed Mauldeth Road Access' demonstrates a visibility splay of 2.4x x 43m can be achieved at the site access.
  - o TROs should be in place at the proposed site access to protect the visibility.
  - o Drawings 'Figure 5.2 - Visibility Splays at Proposed Mauldeth Road Direct Private Driveways' demonstrates that visibility splays of 2.4 x 43m can be achieved at the proposed driveways on Mauldeth Road,
  - o Noted that TROs are in place.
  - o Concerns that a bus using the bus stop will impact on visibility.
  - o Drawing 'Figure 5.3 - Swept Path Analysis: Refuse Vehicle Serving Scheme' demonstrates that a 11.5m refuse vehicle can access the site, manoeuvre the proposed turning head and egress the site safely.
  - o Drawing 'Figure 5.4 - Swept Path Analysis: Fire Appliance Accessing Scheme' demonstrates that a Fire Tender can access the site, manoeuvre the turning head and egress the site safely.

- o Highways requests that the proposed site access is to MCC adoptable standards.
- o Confirmation is requested on whether the applicant will be adopting the internal road.
- o The adopted access road will also require a 20mph speed limit in alignment with the surrounding residential highway network which would require the progression of an associated TRO.
- o Noted that all other existing vehicle access points will be removed. These should be reinstated as footway via a S278 agreement and at the applicant expense.
- o Request that the applicant provide a raised table arrangement at the crossroads. This should include dropped kerb crossings.
- o Request that the applicant provide a signalised crossing within proximity of the site. Location to be agreed as part of detailed design.
- o Request that the applicant provide a green man signal at the existing easter arm of the Mauldeth Road / Kingsway signalised junction to the west of the development site.
- o Confirmation is requested on whether the internal road has a roundabout arrangement.
- o As per Highways pre-application arrangement Statutory Approvals have concerns with this arrangement and would not support the arrangement.

#### Driveways:

- o Plot 15 and Plot 16 will have driveways directly from Mauldeth Road.
- o This is acceptable in principle as the bus stop has limited services.
- o Request tracking is provided for plots 4, 14, 31, 47, 53.

#### Pedestrian Access:

- o A pedestrian access will be in place with the main access from Mauldeth Road.
- o A secondary pedestrian access will be in place from Kingsway.

#### Parking Provision:

- o 1:1 parking for dwellings with in-curtilage parking - acceptable in principle
- o Request that all in-curtilage parking spaces are a minimum of 6m x 3m and communal parking spaces are a minimum of 4.8m x 2.4m.
- o 7 spaces proposed for the apartments. Provision of 54%
- o 2021 census data reviewed data in relation to accommodation type by car and van availability.
- o Data suggests that 51% of residents living in apartments within the area do not have access to a car or van.
- o Acceptable in principle.
- o TROs should be in place to reduce inconsiderate parking and ensure parked vehicles do not impede the internal circulation. Highways would have concerns that no TROs would result in inconsiderate parking and impede the waste vehicle movement around the site.

#### EV CHARGING

- o EV charging should be provided at each driveway space.

- o Communal parking should have a minimum of 20% EVC with ducting for future EVs.

#### CYCLE PARKING:

- o Secure and sheltered cycle store proposed (100% provision) within the garden of each dwelling - acceptable in principle.
- o Secure and sheltered cycle store proposed for the apartments. Provision of 100% - acceptable in principle.

#### BOUNDARY TREATMENTS:

- o It is recommended that all fencing / railings adjacent to the adopted highway are visually permeable from a distance of 600mm upwards to ensure adequate visual permeability for child pedestrians.
- o Requested that vegetation at the site access and driveways are not placed to impinge on visibility.

#### TREES:

- o Street trees noted between the footway and carriageway.
- o Commuted sums are required for any non-standard materials (and street trees) used on the adopted highway.

#### REFUSE AND SERVICING:

- o Drawing 'A815\_P\_102B - Proposed Servicing Plan' provides details on the proposed bin store, bin collection points and waste vehicle collection point.
- o Bin stores are provided within the curtilage of each site.
- o Bin collection points are located throughout the development adjacent to the highway. It is understood that residents will take bins to/from the collection point. It should be ensured that bins are not left on the highway or footway.
- o The proposed waste arrangements meet MCCs GD04 arrangements.
- o Drawing 'Figure 5.3 - Swept Path Analysis: Refuse Vehicle Serving Scheme' demonstrates that a 11.5m refuse vehicle can access the site, manoeuvre the proposed turning head and egress the site safely.

#### STAGE 1 ROAD SAFETY ADUIT:

- o S1 RSA undertaken in November 2024.
- o The audit did not raise significant road safety problems.
- o However, it is unclear if the audit team had the relevant information i.e. swept path analysis, visibility splays etc to undertake a full assessment.
- o Important to note that the development will be subject to further detailed design appraisal during the S278 process and with a S2 and S3 RSA.

#### TRAVEL PLAN:

- o A Framework Travel Plan has been provided as part of the application. The Framework Travel Plan includes objectives, targets and indicators, management strategy, measures to encourage sustainable travel, marketing strategy and a monitoring and a draft action plan.

- o The development, submission, implementation and monitoring of the Travel Plan should be included in the conditions of any planning consent.

## CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT:

The CMP should be submitted prior to the start of works. This should include:

- o Phasing and quantification / classification of vehicular activity.
- o Routeing of vehicles both within the site and on the adjacent highway - evidenced with appropriate swept-path assessment.
- o Consideration of ongoing construction works and contractor parking in the locality.
- o A dilapidation survey including photographs and commentary on the condition of carriageway / footways on construction vehicle routes surrounding the site.

The applicant is advised that any requirements for licensing, hoarding / scaffolding and any associated temporary traffic management arrangements will need discussion and agreement with the council's Highways Applications and Network Resilience teams via Contact Manchester (Tel. 0161 234 5004) Email -highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk.

## TFGM COMMENTS:

- o The trip generation assessment is reasonable. TfGM would refer to the LHA to determine whether the impact of the development in the 'wider network' context as listed in the 'wider network' section of the TA is acceptable. It should be highlighted that if the area is congested, even an increase of less than thirty vehicles per hour could cause an issue.
- o The access should be designed to ensure the provision of tactile paving and dropped kerbs. Any redundant access points should be reinstated accordingly. The TA confirms that this will be implemented.
- o The improvements to the footway on Mauldeth Road are noted and welcomed. A controlled pedestrian crossing facility across Mauldeth Road could be considered as part of the development or a contribution towards a crossing. TfGM would refer to the LHA to determine the appropriate level of mitigation that is commensurate with development.
- o Visibility splays in line with standards contained within Manual for Street should be achievable in both directions from the site access. The TA confirms that this is achievable.
- o Swept path plans are provided within the TA Appendices which demonstrate that a refuse vehicle and fire tender can access and egress the site in a forwards gear, carrying out turning manoeuvres within the on-site turning head.
- o TfGM would query whether the two proposed driveway access points leading directly out onto Mauldeth Road could be relocated to within the site or removed. Additional access points close to the main access and which will involve reversing manoeuvres out onto / or from Mauldeth Road and across the footway are likely to result in additional conflicts to the detriment of pedestrian and highway safety.
- o The TA states that a review of the surrounding TROs has been undertaken and it is considered that no further restrictions are required. TfGM would refer to the LHA to determine whether this is accurate. There should be adequate restrictions surrounding the site to ensure that no parking occurs on street from the development.
- o TfGM Shelters have consulted with representatives from Manchester City Council Highways and Greater Manchester Police, and they are satisfied that the existing bus stop on Mauldeth Road bordering the site can be retained in its existing position, particularly given the low service frequency.
- o The TA confirms that 100% cycle parking will be achieved, with 13 spaces for the apartments provided within a secure and covered shelter and cycle parking provided within the site curtilage of the dwelling houses. The cycle store for the apartments should be internal and benefit from lighting and CCTV within an easily accessible location.

- o A full Travel Plan should be employed for the development within 6 months of occupation and should feature incentives to encourage the uptake of public transport and active travel modes such as discounted cycles, concessionary bus fares, journey planning etc.

#### SUGGESTED CONDITIONS:

EVC

Cycling

Off-Site Highways Works:

Waste Management Strategy

Service Management Strategy

CMP

#### EMAIL DATED 5TH AUGUST 2025 TO PLANNING:

TfGM came back to us last week with the below:

Colleagues from within UTC Design have reviewed the proposals for a pedestrian crossing and have the following comments:

The principle of a crossing in that location appears acceptable from a basic overview, however, it should be noted that this will be subject to a full design, audit and approval process with TfGM UTC Design.

There are concerns from a UTC perspective with the relocation of the bus stop that close to the junction, in terms of worsening the lantern visibility for the A34 junction on approach and vehicles having to overtake buses on a bend in the road. Additionally, any bus stop relocation would need to be approved by TfGM Shelters (shelters@tfgm.com / clair.leeming@tfgm.com).

It should be highlighted that the actual crossing design is not acceptable to UTC. It is not permitted to have any parking spaces between the zig-zags and the kerb. All parking will need to be removed and the zig-zags placed adjacent to the kerb on both sides of the crossing (on the south side of Mauldeth Road). This will obviously be difficult given the adjacent shops/restaurant etc. Both designs are therefore the same in this respect and not acceptable.

It would be possible to reduce the number of zig-zags, particularly on the exit side of the crossing.

For any further requests for information in respect of the crossing design please liaise directly with gmutc@tfgm.com.

Further to the above, TfGM's Shelters team have provided the following response:

TfGM Shelters concur with UTC's comments regarding the relocation of bus stop EB2043 Mauldeth Road. The proposed location places the stop closer to the junction and there are concerns that vehicles will park obstructing the bus stop.

There are concerns from a UTC perspective with the relocation of the bus stop that close to the junction, in terms of worsening the lantern visibility for the A34 junction on approach and vehicles having to overtake buses on a bend in the road.

Colleagues from the Shelter's team will need to undertake a site visit with representatives from GM Police and Manchester City Council to agree a revised stop location.

#### FURTHER COMMENTS 8th OCTOBER 2025:

The following discussions have taken place at a meeting with the applicants planning team, architect and MCC on 2nd October.

Given the concerns with the potential crossing Highways requests that a traffic calming scheme is put in place. This could be in the form of physical build out's at the junction of Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive and traffic humps along Mauldeth Road. Or a raised table at Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive and raised humps along Mauldeth Road. It is requested that these off-site highways works are conditioned, and the detailed design can be undertaken at details design stage.

Highways have received Drawing No. A815\_P\_100L Rev L. As per Highways comments above and within the meeting it is requested that the proposed traffic calming scheme also include the junction of Mauldeth Road / Avonlea Drive and continue to the east along Mauldeth Road to ensure that it covers the whole of the site frontage.

Drawing No. A815\_P\_100L Rev L demonstrates that the roundabout arrangement has been removed within the site. This is welcomed by Highways.

The plan also confirms that footways are 2m wide throughout the site, which is acceptable to Highways.

As per Highways initial comments adopted roads will also require a 20mph speed limit in alignment with the surrounding residential highway network which would require the progression of an associated TRO.

As per Highways initial comments all in-curtilage parking spaces are a minimum of 6m x 3m and communal parking spaces are a minimum of 4.8m x 2.4m.

As per Highways initial comments TROs should be in place to reduce inconsiderate parking and ensure parked vehicles do not impede the internal circulation. Highways would have concerns that no TROs would result in inconsiderate parking and impede the waste vehicle movement around the site.

Highways Reference: 16832/FO/2025