

SLR Consulting Limited

**Date:** 24 July 2025

**Project No.** VN232865

**App No.** 142535/FO/2025

---

## Development at 140 Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, M4 6DU

### 1.0 Introduction

1.1 SLR has been instructed by Liquid Business (Manchester) Limited and Cityside Developments Ltd to provide highways and transport advice in support of a planning application for the following:

*“Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 2no. new buildings providing up to 758 apartments (Use Class C3), Class E floorspace (comprising flexible office accommodation (Use Class Eg(i)) and Class Ea and b) and associated hard and soft landscaping (including works within the public highway), formation of vehicle accesses and servicing access together with associated works”.*

1.2 The planning application was supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) and a Framework Travel Plan (FTP) both dated March 2025 and prepared by SLR Consulting Ltd.

1.3 To date, comments in relation to the submitted documents have been provided by the following Statutory Consultees:

- Manchester City Council (MCC) / Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) Highway - Dated 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2025;
- Active Travel England (ATE) – Dated 30<sup>th</sup> May 2025; and
- Manchester City Council Environment Health Officer (EHO) – Dated June 2025.

1.4 Additionally, a summary of objections to the proposal have been provided – the objections raised include commentary in respect of highways and parking.

1.5 This transport response note has been prepared to provide a comprehensive response and further clarification on the points raised within these responses, with the original comment in italics and the SLR responses below. The response received all raise similar themes, where comments are repeated or overlap the response has been these grouped by topic.

## 2.0 Executive Summary

### 2.1 A summary of the responses to the key comments raised are:

- It is not possible to provide a disabled parking space on site, but disabled users can park on street for free and these are spaces immediately adjacent to the site. There are other formal disabled parking spaces (with Season Tickets) available nearby c.200m away.
- The TROs on the local streets would need to be reviewed through a S278 highway design process. This would include the need for On-Street Parking provision and would examine the opportunities for replacement parking spaces (on Ducie St/Store St) and the provision of a disabled parking space on Ducie Street adjacent to the site. If these solutions result in a loss of On Street P&D parking spaces and a consequent loss of future revenue, then a commuted sum would be payable. As the choice of alternative spaces needs careful assessment and design, we recommend that a suitable condition be applied which states that alternative on street parking should be provided and secured through a Section 278 agreement and if there is a loss of P&D parking revenue then a commuted sum be paid.
- TfGM have requested a Green Man Pedestrian Crossing of the Store St arm of the Gt Ancoats St signals. The current arrangement for a dropped kerb crossing and an offset Puffin/Pelican Crossing to the south has only recently been installed as part of the Gt Ancoats St Improvement Scheme, the purpose of which was to improve crossings for pedestrians in terms of safety and convenience. As there could be adverse implications of installing a Green Man crossing both in highway operation and road safety terms, as well as leaving open the status of the existing Puffin/Pelican facility (which is convenient for disabled access into the site) we consider that the current arrangement is suitable and provides a safe and appropriate means of crossing.
- There are a range of offsite highway changes with the scheme which would be picked up via the S278 detailed design process and can be conditioned. In addition, a suitably worded landscaping condition can cover the issues of boundary treatment, internal signing and visitor cycle parking.
- There has been a request to install lighting of the Store Street Aqueduct Bridge. However, there is uncertainty whether there is a need for lighting improvement, whether a technical solution is possible given the physical constraints and the Grade II listing and this also gives uncertainty to the cost implications. Given this, the uncertainty the developer requests clarification on the need and the cost associated with the lighting improvements works.
- A suitably worded Travel Plan condition is expected to support the sustainable transport strategy for the site.
- A suitably worded Cycle Parking condition can ensure that the cycle parking provision is of a high quality and that spaces are made available for 5% accessible cycles.



- The scheme does not comply with Waste Guidance GD04 due to the practical nature of managing waste from such a tall tower and in particular the volume of bins that need to be presented for collection. Therefore, it is proposed that collections are made twice weekly. As this is not compliant, a suitably worded planning obligation requiring the collection of waste in accordance with a Waste Management Strategy, the provision will then be maintained for the lifetime of the development. The obligation would also indemnify MCC from the potential costs of waste collection should they have to step in as a collector of last resort.
- A Construction Management Plan will be secured by way of a planning condition; the CEMP will incorporate measures to manage and mitigate the implications of construction on the highway.

### 3.0 MCC / TfGM Highways Consultation Comments

- 3.1 A response from MCC / TfGM in relation to Highways was received (via email) on 3rd June 2025. As discussed above, the original comment is in italics and the SLR response below. The key points of the response are highlighted.

#### Highway Safety

##### MCC/TfGM Comment:

*The road safety data should be updated to the latest available data which should include 2024.*

##### SLR Response:

- 3.2 We have examined the most recent accident data from GMTU (see below) and this shows that there have not been any new personal injury accidents recorded in the area and with time progressing, one accident is lost from the 5-year data so the number over the last 5 years is now 6 accidents. Therefore, there is no change to the data used to assess the accident conditions of the highway network. Therefore, the conclusions of the TA remain that despite the network carrying high traffic flows there is no inherent accident risk on the network.





## Parking

### Comment:

*Request that the applicant provide a disabled parking space within the red line boundary of the site.*

### SLR Response:

- 3.3 **Given the limited size of the site and constraints, the inclusion of disable parking provision within the red-line boundary is not This is not practical given the site constraints and land available.** There are examples and existing precedents within Manchester Centre, (Viadux Phase 2, Union Towers 1&2, Axis Tower among others). However, there is scope for disabled users to benefit from parking adjacent of nearby. Blue Badge holders can park on the Ducie Street (adjacent c.5m away) or Store Street P&D parking bays (c.100m away) without charge. The nearest formal parking site is 200m away on Tariff Street where 14 disabled spaces are available in the car park there. There are other more informal off-street spaces located closer such as the SiP Ducie Street parking opposite the new site (c.20m away).
- 3.4 As discussed next the developer will need to amend the TRO's in the area and there is scope to identify a P&D space on Ducie Street adjacent to the site as a Disabled Space. If this resulted in a requirement for a commuted sum to offset parking revenue loss, then this could be considered as part of the on-street parking assessment delivered via the S278.



**Comment:**

**On-Street Parking Bays:**

- *TA notes that the new vehicular access points will have an impact on existing on street parking bays on Ducie Street.*
- *Three bays will be removed on Ducie Street and be relocated.*
- *Potential impact on the existing bays to the east of the proposed access point.*
- *Noted that no loss on on-street parking is anticipated to occur.*
- *The applicant should provide an engineering drawing on where these bays will be relocated to an ensure they do not impact on neighbouring access points etc. assessment should include swept path analysis and visibility splays. This assessment should be included in the S1 RSA.*
- *The applicant should note that the relocation of bays does have a commuted sum, subject to confirmation and discussion with Manchester Parking Team.*
- *The applicant should note that if no suitable location can be found for the bays then they will have to pay £50k - £55k per bay, subject to confirmation and discussion with Manchester Parking Team.*

*A review of the existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) should be undertaken surrounding the site.*

**SLR Response:**

- 3.5 As a principal the developer will seek to relocate any lost parking spaces as that is seen as a benefit for the area. From an initial view there would appear to be space available to relocate bays, however, the location of any replacement bays is not straight forward and requires assessment of the highway operation, detailed highway design and a road safety audit and consideration of changes to the TROs. Given this, **we recommend that a suitable condition be applied which states that alternative on street parking should be provided and secured through a Section 278 agreement and if there is a loss of P&D parking revenue then a commuted sum be paid.**



## Off-site Highways Works – Pedestrian Crossing

### Comments:

#### Pedestrian Crossing:

- *The TA notes the lack of appropriate crossing at the existing Store Street / Great Ancoats Street junction.*
- *It is requested that the applicant fund the installation of a green man signal.*
- *TfGM would highlight that adding pedestrians across the mouth of the junction would need an all-red stage. This would have an impact on the capacity of the junction, which will need to be modelled to understand the impact.*
- *TfGM would also highlight that any costs associated with the relocation/removal/additional works would need to be funded by the development not the local authority.*
- *TA notes that the existing pedestrian crossing on Store Street would be within c. 16m of the proposed access point.*
- *As the development is having a potential impact on the crossing and pedestrian safety MCC request that the applicant undertake a S1 RSA.*

### SLR Response:

- 3.6 There is currently an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing at the Store Street / Great Ancoats Street junction supported by an offset Pelican Crossing to the southwest on Store Street. While this provides an existing crossing facility, we acknowledge that TfGM's preference is for a formalised, signal-controlled crossing at the Store St arm of the Gt Ancoats St junction. However, this arrangement has only recently been installed as part of the Gt Ancoats St Improvement Scheme the purpose of which was to improve crossings for pedestrians in terms of safety and convenience.
- 3.7 There could be adverse consequences in highway operation on Gt Ancoats St and possibly highway safety with such a change and at this stage it is unclear whether the existing Puffin/Pelican crossing facility would need to be removed (as drivers may see the second signal on Green and ignore a closer Red signal).
- 3.8 Currently pedestrians can conveniently cross Store Street at the informal crossing and there are gaps in the traffic signalling to do so safely. For those who need extra time or certainty to cross they can use the Puffin/Pelican crossing noting that the ramped access into the site is close to that crossing.
- 3.9 Given this, we consider that the existing pedestrian arrangement is suitable and safe for highway operation.



## Off-site Highways Works – Other

### Comments:

*TfGM recommend the following:*

- *With reference to Section 4.8 of the TA, a more formal process of determining the active travel provision should be determined by using the Streets for All Design Check.*
- *Any redundant vehicle access points bordering the site should be reinstated as continuous footway to adoptable standards.*
- *Footway resurfacing and renewal undertaken as appropriate.*
- *Ensure the provision of tactile paving and dropped kerbs across both sides of all the site access points and at junctions within the vicinity of the site.*
- *Provision of continuous 2-metre-wide footways within and surrounding the development i.e., any footways in the vicinity of the proposed development should be widened to the minimum standard of 2.0 metres (where possible).*
- *Proposed service/access road subject to a S1 RSA and detailed design*

### Additional ATE Comments:

ATE have provided similar comments to TfGM with regard to the off-site highway design they have also suggested that ‘*footways at either end of the service road connecting Ducie Street and Store Street to remain uninterrupted and level through the similar use of a raised table treatment at each access point*’.

### SLR Response:

- 3.10 The highways surrounding the site have recently been upgraded (2021) through the Gt Ancoats St. Improvement Scheme and are considered to be of good quality and on this basis, we do not consider that a Streets for All Design Check would add further value
- 3.11 The reinstatement of redundant vehicle access points, footway resurfacing and renewal, and the provision of tactile paving and dropped kerbs are all acceptable and will be secured via the Section 278 agreement and Road Safety Audited. The provision of raised footways at the access points would be subject to agreement with MCC. We can confirm that a continuous 2.0m minimum wide footway(s) would be provided around the site and that these are of a good quality and comply with guidance.
- 3.12 **The works on the adopted highway would be subject to a S278 agreement and this can be secured via a standard condition.**



## Off-site Highways Works – Street Lighting

### Comments:

- *The aqueduct under the Ashton Canal for Store Street is a wide bridge - this street isn't lit, and lighting could be provided to make this a more attractive walking route from the site to Piccadilly station etc.*
- *The streetlighting levels o*
- *n Ducie Street should be assessed using an industry standard measure of ensuring the street lighting is of a good standard.*

- 3.13 The environment under the Aqueduct benefits from the lighting spilling out from the street lighting either side and the arch is rendered and painted leaving this as a relatively bright environment even at night and these lighting levels may comply with the appropriate guidance.
- 3.14 Lighting of the Store Street Aqueduct has narrow footways which prevent columns being installed and the Grade II listed structure complicates the planning considerations and due to the low bridge height, any installation is at risk of being struck by a vehicle.
- 3.15 Given the uncertainty about whether there is a need for a lighting scheme and if so, the technical practicalities of delivering a solution, the developer requests clarification on the need and the cost associated with the lighting improvements works.

## Travel Plan & Cycle Parking

### Comments:

1 *In order to encourage sustainable journeys to mitigate the traffic impact of the development, through the Travel Plan, incentives should be offered to encourage users of the site to use public transport and active travel modes through measures such as concessionary bus fares, discounted cycles, journey planning etc.*

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

*With regard to the submitted Travel Plan, there would be a condition requiring a final Travel Plan attached to any permission and we have the following comments with what we would expect from the final Travel Plan:*

- *838 long-stay cycle parking spaces are proposed. These should be maintained as available for use for the lifetime of the development (unless a change is agreed by us in future), which in practice means abandoned bikes should be removed at least every five years. This should be written into the travel plan. There should also be provision for visitor cycle parking.*
- *The suggested targets (8.15) for modal shift are probably too small, but this will depend on the baseline. More ambitious targets should be used for the final travel plan.*



- *The Travel Plan should be kept for the lifetime of the development (currently it is proposed (9.1) to stop implementing the travel plan after year five).*

**SLR Response:**

- 3.16 **We expect a condition requiring an Implementation Travel Plan to be prepared and submitted prior to occupation.** That condition would require the ongoing monitoring. As the scheme is a high-quality car free development within the city centre boundary, there is not expected to be much potential to improve on what would be very high levels of active travel. If MCC/TfGM require, it the Travel Plan can be extended beyond 5 years, then this can be provided. We note that the plan is a flexible document reviewed annually and can be updated accordingly.
- 3.17 As part of the Travel Plan measures, all residents / users will receive a Travel Pack / Induction Pack upon occupation. These packs will include information on available sustainable travel incentives such as available bus fare discounts from the bus operators, access to discounted cycles (e.g. via the Cycle to Work Scheme), and links to journey planning tools and resources to encourage use of active and public transport modes. The Travel Plan Co-ordinator will also seek to liaise with local bus and cycle operators to establish available discounts, which will then be promoted to residents.
- 3.18 The utilisation of cycle parking would be monitored via the Travel Plan and if the surveys reveal a lack of take up then the TP Coordinator would liaise with TfGM on offering Cycle Vouchers.

**TfGM Comments:**

*Please also advise how visitor cycle parking would be accommodated and submit amended plans showing this and the disabled parking.*

*TfGM would note that all cycle parking should be to LTN1/20 standard. The cycle parking should benefit from security measures such as CCTV and lighting with plenty of natural surveillance. Cycle maintenance tools should also be provided.*

*The cycle parking provision uptake should be monitored and if under-utilised, residents could be provided with vouchers towards the TfGM cycle scheme as an incentive to cycle, which could form part of the Travel Plan initiatives.*



### ATE Comments:

*Further details of cycle parking must specify that 5% of each section of provision is able to be used by adapted cycles, as per paragraph 11.3.2 of LTN 1/20.*

*It is not clear where short stay cycle parking would be located within the site, and at what capacity*

*The potential for the development to support the expansion of nearby Bee Network cycle hire facilities at Old Mill St. and Redhill St. should be explored in dialogue with TfGM.*

### SLR Response:

- 3.19 Cycle Parking would be provided to LTN1/20 standard. A minimum of 5% of total cycle spaces in each storage area designed to accommodate non-standard/adapted cycles such as tricycles or handcycles. **The cycle parking provision and supporting equipment can be secured by condition.**
- 3.20 **Short-stay (visitor) cycle parking will be accommodated on-site and can be secured by an appropriate landscape condition.**
- 3.21 On the Starling Bank Bike docking stations, it is evident that these are not the most used locations and that from observation these docking stations do not require expansion. We therefore don't consider that expansion of these docking stations is required.

## On Site Public Realm & Boundary Treatment

### Comments:

*It is understood that the public realm is within the red line boundary of the site and will not impact the adopted highway.*

*If the public realm does impact the adopted highway it is recommended that all public realm designs and materials are agreed with MCC's Capital Programmes and Property team prior to site works beginning. The MCC Flood Risk Management and Street Lighting teams will need to be consulted to discuss lighting and drainage associated with the site public realm.*

*For the avoidance of doubt, all non-standard materials to be used on the adopted highway will be subject to applicable commuted sums, likewise for the implementation of street trees on the highway.*

*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.*

*The applicant should be advised that all gated accesses will need to provide inward opening gates to ensure they do not impact on the adopted footway or highway.*

*Walking and cycling directional signage to the City Centre should be provided within the site.*



**SLR Response:**

- 3.22 The above is understood. The applicant acknowledges that **an appropriate landscaping condition can cover off the above comments.**

**Refuse and Servicing**

*Waste Management Strategy should be conditioned.*

*TA confirms that service vehicles will be required to notify their arrival to the site management.*

*Resident management staff will be in charge of on-site marshalling and ensure no unauthorised parking is taking place. Further details of the marshalling of the service bay are required in terms of the monitoring arrangements, for example duration period / standard of completed works etc.*

**SLR Response:**

- 3.23 **A condition for an updated Waste Management Strategy is expected prior to occupation.** This document would benefit from the approach of the on-site FM team who are yet to be appointed, and it is they that need to consider how to manage vehicle arrivals and goods deliveries both externally and internally, who has responsibility for goods transfer and potentially temporary storage of goods while they wait to be collected. This consideration affects the dwell time, and the pre-booking of delivery slots.
- 3.24 Given the above it is appropriate that pre-occupation condition is applied requiring a Waste & Servicing Strategy be prepared and agreed with MCC at which point the FM team would have been appointed and can inform on the strategy.



### MCC's EHO (Waste) Comment:

*The residential waste provision does not comply with MCC's Waste Guidance GD04 and that all residential waste should be separate from any commercial provision.*

### SLR Response:

- 3.25 The MCC guidance GD04 states that for Tall Buildings the Bin Store should provide 0.43sqm per apartment (or 240sqm Block A and 86 sqm Block B). The Bin Store provision is Block A - 191sqm and Block B - 98 sqm.
- 3.26 A critical aspect in the Waste Strategy is the volume of bins that can practically be presented for collection. With a strategy for a twice weekly collection then up to 21 Eurobins are brought out for collection twice a week. A weekly collection increases that to 42 Eurobins at a time and there is simply not the space to bring those out and present them for collection.
- 3.27 We recognise that such a strategy does not comply with MCC guidance and their framework agreements for collection. We are aware that other tall tower non-compliant schemes that have been approved with an appropriate planning condition that protects MCC's position on the risk of future waste collection costs. **Therefore, a suitably worded planning obligation requiring the collection of waste in accordance with a Waste Management Strategy, the provision will then be maintained for the lifetime of the development. The obligation would also indemnify MCC from the potential costs of waste collection should they have to step in as a collector of last resort.**
- 3.28 It is noted that the commercial bins would be kept separate from the residential. In terms of the commercial elements, we expect that some (such as a café/bakery) would store waste within their own demise and bring that out for collection on a frequent basis. The office-based waste calculations have reduced with extra WfH effect and there are some waste streams that are typically stored within the premises. The forecast volumes of waste from the commercial land uses would be better determined once the occupiers are known and are included in **an updated Waste & Servicing Strategy to be conditioned prior to occupation.**



## Construction Management Plan

### Comments:

*A Construction Management Plan should be conditioned. The CMP should be submitted prior to the start of works. This should include:*

*Phasing and quantification / classification of vehicular activity.*

*Routeing of vehicles both within the site and on the adjacent highway - evidenced with appropriate swept-path assessment.*

*Consideration of ongoing construction works and contractor parking in the locality.*

*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](mailto:highwaylicences@manchester.gov.uk).*

*TfGM notes that there is an existing bus stop outside the site on Great Ancoats Street which appears to be unaffected by the development. Should construction works be likely to impact upon the use of the stop, the applicant will need to liaise with [stop.closures@tfgm.com](mailto:stop.closures@tfgm.com) prior to undertaking any works.*

### SLR Response:

- 3.29 Noted. **A Construction Management Plan would be a condition to the planning permission.**



## 4.0 Active Travel England (ATE) Consultation Comments

- 4.1 A planning response from Active Travel England (ATE) was received on 30<sup>th</sup> of May 2025. Four main issues are raised by ATE: Trip Generation Assignment and Mode Shares, Off-site infrastructure and On-site facilities. The first two issues are dealt with below while the others are duplicated in the comments from TfGM/MCC and have been considered above.

### Trip Generation Assignment & Mode Shares

#### ATE Comment:

*The multi-modal trip generation analysis which has been presented should be expanded to cover the whole day, rather than being confined to peak hours, to ensure that a holistic understanding of active travel requirements is adequately demonstrated.*

#### SLR Response:

- 4.2 We acknowledge ATE's recommendation to present multimodal trip generation data for the entire day, rather than focusing solely on peak periods. However, it is worth noting that the peak hours were tested as part of the TA to consider any issues within these key time periods. As this site is a car free development the active travel element will be the majority of trips made.
- 4.3 Table F of the TA provided the multi-modal trip generation figures for the site. For completeness and to address the comment above, this has been reproduced with daily trip generation figures, now presented as **Table 3.1** below. **Table 3.2** below also presents the only element of vehicle use to and from the development for both the residential and office element over the course of a day.
- 4.4 **Table 3.3** also indicates the percentage of active travel and shared travel trips that will be made over the course of a whole day from the proposed development.



**Table 3.1: Proposed Trip Generation for Sustainable Transport Modes**

| Time Period                                                 | AM Peak (08:00 - 09:00) |            |            | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |           |            | Daily (07:00-21:00) |            |             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|
| Type of Trip                                                | Arr.                    | Dep.       | Total      | Arr.                  | Dep.      | Total      | Arr.                | Dep.       | Total       |
| Private Flats<br>Pedestrian Trip<br>Rates per Flat          | 0.035                   | 0.14       | 0.175      | 0.075                 | 0.058     | 0.133      | 0.832               | 0.85       | 1.682       |
| <b>Private Flats<br/>Pedestrian Trips</b>                   | 27                      | 106        | 133        | 57                    | 44        | 101        | 631                 | 644        | 1275        |
| Office Pedestrian<br>Trip Rates per<br>100sqm               | 0.302                   | 0.128      | 0.43       | 0.057                 | 0.203     | 0.26       | 2.855               | 2.947      | 5.802       |
| <b>Office<br/>Pedestrian Trips</b>                          | 12                      | 5          | 17         | 2                     | 8         | 10         | 115                 | 118        | 233         |
| <b>Total Pedestrian<br/>Trips</b>                           | <b>39</b>               | <b>111</b> | <b>150</b> | <b>59</b>             | <b>52</b> | <b>111</b> | <b>745</b>          | <b>763</b> | <b>1508</b> |
| Private Flats<br>Bicycle Trip Rates<br>per Flat             | 0                       | 0.005      | 0.005      | 0.003                 | 0.003     | 0.006      | 0.025               | 0.024      | 0.049       |
| <b>Private Flats<br/>Bicycle Trips</b>                      | 0                       | 4          | 4          | 2                     | 2         | 5          | 19                  | 18         | 37          |
| Office Bicycle Trip<br>Rates per<br>100sqm                  | 0.146                   | 0.001      | 0.147      | 0.001                 | 0.135     | 0.136      | 0.366               | 0.37       | 0.736       |
| <b>Office Bicycle<br/>Trips</b>                             | 6                       | 0          | 6          | 0                     | 5         | 5          | 15                  | 15         | 30          |
| <b>Total Bicycle<br/>Trips</b>                              | <b>6</b>                | <b>4</b>   | <b>10</b>  | <b>2</b>              | <b>8</b>  | <b>10</b>  | <b>34</b>           | <b>33</b>  | <b>67</b>   |
| Private Flats<br>Public Transport<br>Trip Rates per<br>Flat | 0.022                   | 0.285      | 0.307      | 0.12                  | 0.028     | 0.148      | 0.869               | 0.964      | 1.833       |
| <b>Private Flats<br/>Public Transport<br/>Trips</b>         | 17                      | 216        | 233        | 91                    | 21        | 112        | 659                 | 731        | 1389        |
| Office Public<br>Transport Trip<br>Rates per<br>100sqm      | 1.499                   | 0.045      | 1.544      | 0.061                 | 1.502     | 1.563      | 4.438               | 4.337      | 8.775       |
| <b>Office Public<br/>Transport Trips</b>                    | 60                      | 2          | 62         | 2                     | 60        | 63         | 178                 | 174        | 353         |
| <b>Total Public<br/>Transport Trips</b>                     | <b>77</b>               | <b>218</b> | <b>295</b> | <b>93</b>             | <b>82</b> | <b>175</b> | <b>837</b>          | <b>905</b> | <b>1742</b> |



**Table 3.2: Proposed Total Residential and Office Trip Generation**

| Time Period                                           | AM Peak (08:00-09:00) |          |           | PM Peak (17:00-18:00) |          |           | Daily (07:00-21:00) |            |            |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|---------------------|------------|------------|
| Type of Trip                                          | Arr.                  | Dep.     | Total     | Arr.                  | Dep.     | Total     | Arr.                | Dep.       | Total      |
| Private Flats LGV, OGV and Taxi Trip Rates per Flat   | 0.010                 | 0.008    | 0.018     | 0.006                 | 0.006    | 0.012     | 0.144               | 0.149      | 0.293      |
| Private Flats LGV, OGV and Taxi Trips                 | 8                     | 6        | 14        | 5                     | 5        | 9         | 109                 | 113        | 222        |
| Office LGV, OGV and Taxi Trip Rates per 100sqm        | 0.036                 | 0.023    | 0.059     | 0.015                 | 0.022    | 0.037     | 0.221               | 0.219      | 0.44       |
| Office LGV, OGV and Taxi Trips                        | 1                     | 1        | 2         | 1                     | 1        | 1         | 9                   | 9          | 18         |
| <b>Proposed Uses Combined LGV, OGV and Taxi Trips</b> | <b>9</b>              | <b>7</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>5</b>              | <b>5</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>118</b>          | <b>122</b> | <b>240</b> |

**Table 3.3: Proposed Modal Split Percentages based on TRICS Data**

| Time Period                             | Daily (07:00 - 21:00) |      |       | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------|------|-------|------------|
|                                         | Arr.                  | Dep. | Total |            |
| Total pedestrians                       | 745                   | 763  | 1508  | 42%        |
| Total cyclists                          | 34                    | 33   | 67    | 2%         |
| Total Public Transport                  | 837                   | 905  | 1742  | 49%        |
| Total Vehicles (incl. Taxi, LGVs, HGVs) | 118                   | 122  | 240   | 7%         |
| Total                                   | 1734                  | 1823 | 3557  | 100%       |

- 4.5 **Table 3.3** shows that the highest percentage of trips from the proposed development will be from both pedestrians and public transport trips, with these making up a combined total of 91% of total trips plus a modest number of cyclists.
- 4.6 **This information therefore provides ATE with the information requested** and demonstrates the very high Active Travel and Public Transport use, noting that the arrival of vehicles would largely arise from Servicing and Taxis.

