

access onto the network and no deterioration elsewhere on the network over a 15 year period after the development opens. Furthermore the HA's assessment of no deterioration is made on a case by case basis and becomes increasingly important the closer junctions are to their theoretical capacity. [133, 178]

285. Given the current conditions on the A585(T) I consider it likely that more junctions would have reached their capacity, within the normal 15 year design period, and there is certainly no guarantee that the HA would be able to secure funding to make the necessary improvements. Indeed I have little doubt that funding would be harder to secure if the issue was simply one of congestion, rather than safety. [178]

286. The ES partly addresses the cumulative impact of other development nearby, including the applicant's proposals for a business park and a neighbourhood centre. However the TAs for those proposals include Poolfoot Farm within their base assessments and it is reasonable to expect that mitigation measures, associated with those schemes, would reflect their impact over and above the impact of Poolfoot Farm. Nevertheless the lack of a comprehensive plan for regeneration of the SLD means that individual proposals are being assessed on a piecemeal basis, making it less likely that the fundamental problems of congestion will be properly addressed. [81, 82, 179]

287. Indeed the ESP recognises that the A585(T) is currently operating close to capacity and that small scale improvements are insufficient to resolve the problems. The provision of an additional 510 dwellings would certainly add to those problems. I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the free flow of traffic. [188, 223]

### *Design*

288. Design is a matter that is reserved for future consideration. Nevertheless the proposals are constrained by the scope of the ES and permission for the most recently proposed 510 dwelling scheme would be tied to a layout parameters master plan. Siting was defined for the earlier 470 dwelling proposal, but the layout of the more recent scheme is in indicative form only. [3, 4]

289. I am satisfied that the development would achieve a suitable mix of dwelling sizes and types and that an appropriate level of affordable housing would be provided. No indication is given of the dwellings' likely appearance, under the earlier scheme, but the suggested style of housing for the most recent proposal is fairly typical of modern estates and similar to new development close nearby. It would however appear in stark contrast to the streets of terraced Edwardian housing that line the eastern edge of the site. [7, 30, 31, 70, 74]

290. The level of parking provision need not exceed 1.5 spaces per dwelling and, in my view, the layout of both schemes would be broadly acceptable in terms of the LP and the principles outlined in "By Design - Better Places to Live". However the later proposal clearly makes more efficient use of the land and, as far as I am aware, the earlier scheme makes no provision for a bridleway. [18, 70, 71, 73, 75, 128]

291. Both proposals indicate that the 2 ponds, which exist on the site, would be retained. That is clearly desirable, in principle, because these are important natural features. In practice however I am not convinced that it would be practicable to retain them in the limited open space available, given the danger of access by young children. [6, 73, 205]

292. The central and southern parts of the site are raised and I am concerned that the 10m high multi-storey town houses, which are proposed here, would look unduly prominent in this