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Subject Matter 3 – Housing and Employment Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) and Requirements

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Lichfields is instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Limited [TW] to make representations on its behalf to the Wyre Council Local Plan [WCLP].

1.2 This statement has been prepared in response to the Matters, Issues and Questions raised by the Inspector for the Matter 3 Examination in Public [EiP] hearing sessions.

1.3 Separate representations have been submitted in respect of the following Matters:
   1. Matter 1 – Legal Compliance, Procedural Requirements and the Duty to Cooperate
   2. Matter 2 – Strategy and Strategic Policies
   3. Matter 4 – Housing Land Supply
   4. Matter 5 – Specific Housing Needs and Generic Housing Policies
   5. Matter 8 – Allocations (Garstang, Bowgreave, Catterall and Barton)
   6. Matter 9 – Infrastructure and Delivery

1.4 These Matter Papers' representations should be read in conjunction with previous submissions on the WCLP [Representer ID 363] as well as those made on other Matters listed above.

1.5 TW is seeking to bring forward a high quality sustainable and comprehensively masterplanned residential extension on land west of Cockerham Road (SA1/16) and land further to the north and west of this proposed allocation. This would assist in the delivery of sustainable development within the borough by making a significant contribution towards meeting the identified needs for market and affordable housing.

1.6 This statement expands upon TW’s previous representations in light of the Inspector’s issues and questions. Where relevant, the comments made are assessed against the tests of soundness established by the National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] and the National Planning Practice Guidance [Practice Guidance].
2.0 Planning Issues

Issue 1 – The Housing OAN

1.1 Does the evidence base support the OAN housing of 479 dwellings per annum (dpa) of 9,580 dwellings for the LP period?

2.1 TW considers that the general approach taken by Turley in deriving the Council’s OAHN by aligning the economic aspirations with the housing needs is appropriate in this instance. Although we have some queries on the intricacies of the modelling methodology, in this instance the OAHN of 479 dpa over the plan period is in the right magnitude.

2.2 The Council’s evidence base on housing need\(^1\), suggests and OAHN range for Wyre of between 400dpa and 479dpa over the period from 2011 to 2031. It is noted that the 2016 SHMA\(^2\) recommends that the OAHN is at the upper end of the range (i.e. 479 dpa) in order to mitigate the risks associated with a declining working age population and support higher levels of affordable housing delivery. An approval which we support

1.3 Alternatively should the OAN be lower taking into account the new methodology for calculating housing need proposed within the draft revisions to the NPPF?

2.3 The Government consulted on a White Paper, ‘Fixing our Broken Housing Market’ in November 2017 which included an alternative and standardised methodology for calculating OAN. This methodology has not been formally published and remains in draft. As such, it can be afforded very limited weight.

2.4 The draft changes to the Framework and the Practice Guide include provision for the standardised methodology but it is not anticipated that they will be formally published until later this year. Annex 1 (Implementation) of the draft changes to the Framework\(^3\) sets out that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the Framework. Furthermore, the policies in the current iteration of the Framework will apply for the purpose of examining plans where those plans are submitted on or before ‘the date which is six months after the date of the final Framework’s publication’. The WBLP has already been submitted and as such, its robustness will be considered in the context of the current Framework.

2.5 Regardless, the use of the standardised methodology for Wyre would result in an OAN of 313 dpa which is below the housing requirement being pursued in the WBLP. However, the draft Practice Guidance points out that “the need figure generated by the standard method should be considered as the minimum starting point in establishing a need figure for the purposes of the plan production.” Furthermore, the draft Practice Guidance outlines the circumstances where an uplift will be appropriate including, ‘where growth strategies are in place’. As such, there is no reason why WBC could not pursue a housing requirement figure above the starting point prescribed by the standardised methodology. It is also worth bearing in mind that the standardised methodology will be revised when the new set of household projections are released this year, which would increase the housing OAN figure, hence pursuing a lower figure would be premature.

---

\(^1\) 2013 Fylde Coast Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2014 Addendum I, 2016 Addendum II and 2017 Addendum III

\(^2\) 2016 Fylde Coast Strategic Market Assessment: Wyre Addendum 2 [SHMA Addendum 2]

\(^3\) §208
**Issue 4 – The Housing Requirement of 8,225 dwellings**

4.1 Does the shortfall in the housing requirement against the OAN reflect a positively prepared LP and one that is justified?

2.6 TW considers that WBC has not put forward a Local Plan which has been positively prepared and the strategy being pursued by WBC is unjustified. The Council’s evidence base identifies a OAHN of 9,580 dwellings over the plan period (479dpa). The Council considers that it is unable to meet its full OAHN due to highway capacity and flood risk constraints. The Council has stated that they only have enough land available to deliver 86% of their housing OAN, without resulting in a severe highway impact, which represents a shortfall of 1,356 dwellings over the plan period.

2.7 The Framework\(^4\) sets out that for a Plan to be considered sound at Examination it must demonstrate that it has been: positively prepared; justified; effective; and consistent with national policy. TW considers that the housing requirement set out in the WCLP is neither positively prepared nor justified.

*Positively Prepared*

2.8 To demonstrate that a plan has been positively prepared, it must be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. The WCLP does not seek to meet its full OAHN or cooperate effectively with a neighbouring authority within its HMA to cater for its full OAHN. The evidence which underpins the Local Plan does not consider, in sufficient detail, if large scale infrastructure improvements can be put in place to alleviate the highway capacity concerns.

2.9 Furthermore, the evidence presented is not fit for purpose and represents a rudimental methodology which does not reflect the importance of the issue being dealt with. Only meeting 86% of the Authority’s OAHN, and making no allowances for its provision within the HMA is a matter of significant importance and the evidence presented by the Council to justify their position is disproportionate.

2.10 It is not explicitly clear how the Council has derived that they can deliver 86% of the OAHN. WBC should have tested a range of scenarios, for instance would the delivery of 90% or 95% of the OAHN result in a severe impact and explicitly set out in evidence that more than 86% but less than the full OAHN could not be delivered. Furthermore, if more development was directed towards the more sustainable settlements would the Council be able to deliver more of its housing need. This should also have been explored in detail.

2.11 In order to meet this national requirement on demonstrating soundness, WBC should have explored every avenue to meet their full OAHN. In the first instance, the Council should have determined the full package of mitigation measure which would be required to accommodate the Council’s full OAHN and consider if the proposed allocations could deliver the necessary infrastructure through developer obligations. Then the Council should have explored a variety of spatial distribution strategies and/or considered strategies for delivering strategic sites which could deliver large scale infrastructure improvements to alleviate capacity issues. Finally, the Council should have properly modelled the impact of all the committed highway improvement works which are being delivered and assess if any additional highway capacity has become available.

\(^{4}\) §182
2.12 To be considered justified in the context of national policy, “the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence”. TW does not consider that the plan put forward by WBC is the most appropriate strategy for delivering its full OAHN. TW has undertaken its own modelling analysis of the highway constraints and consider that the Council’s assumptions on the scale of the highway constraint are overstated. TW’s highway analysis (Traffic and Transport Note) is attached at Appendix 1 and sets out that the highway network can accommodate additional traffic movements, above that being planned for in the WCLP, without causing a severe impact on the highway network and the Council’s concerns over highway capacity are overstated.

2.13 Every avenue should be pursued by WBC to meeting their full OAHN and as such, the Council’s current approach being pursued in the WCLP is not the most appropriate strategy for meeting the OAHN for WBC. Failing to meet the Council’s OAHN and making no provision for its delivery within the wider HMA is a significant issue and represents a decision that should only be taken when appropriately justified by proportionate evidence. The Council’s current evidence base does not meet this requirement.

2.14 WBC’s evidence base does not explore all ‘reasonable alternatives’ to meet their full OAHN. Alternative strategies on spatial distribution, modal splits, improvements to public transport, junction improvements and large strategic urban extensions to enable associated major infrastructure improvements have not been explored, assessed and documented in sufficient detail in the evidence base.

2.15 Given the significant importance of meeting an area’s full OAHN, only in unique circumstances should an area be able to demonstrate a sound plan at examination which does not meet its requirement. To diverge away from meeting its OAHN a Local Authority should provide ‘proportionate evidence’ and in this instance, TW considers that the evidence presented is flawed and does not consider all reasonable alternatives in sufficient detail.

4.2 Are the highway constraints overstated?

2.16 TW and their highway consultant, Curtins, consider that the Council’s assessment of highway capacity is overly cautious and additional movements can be accommodated within the existing network without causing a severe impact.

2.17 Lancashire County Highways did not fully take into account major highway improvements that were planned in the area when considering future capacities. The opening of the Broughton Bypass has been operational since October 2017. Further discussions with Lancashire County Highways have confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined but it is clear from on site observations that some of the earlier issues have been alleviated. As such, this major improvement needs to be taken into account in revised evidence prepared and presented as part of the examination to underpin the Council’s plan.

2.18 Furthermore, additional mitigation measures could be delivered by future planned developments as part of off-site highway improvements. These improvements could be delivered via S.278 works and significantly improve the highway capacity.

2.19 The attached Traffic and Transport Note provides further details and explanation on why the Council’s highway constraints are overstated.

\[\text{§182}\]
4.3 In particular would development to meet the OAN result in severe residual cumulative impacts on the highway network having regard to improvements that can be undertaken?

2.20 The shortfall of 1,356 dwellings between the OAHN and the Local Plan equates to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database) spread across the entire highway network in the authority area. This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts.

2.21 It is also considered that LCC highways do not fully take into account major highway improvements that are planned in the area when considering future capacities. As the WCLP will run to 2031 it is considered that major highway improvements should be fully considered. As set out in Section 3 of the attached Highway Note, there are major highway improvements planned in the form of the Preston Western Distributor Road. Furthermore, since the completion of the LHA’s review, the Broughton Bypass is now operational (as of October 2017). Further discussions with the LHA have confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined but it is clear from onsite observations that some of the earlier issues have been alleviated.

2.22 Notwithstanding the above, the capacity assessments confirm that there is sufficient capacity on the local highway network and that the residual cumulative impact on the highway network will not be severe, subject to LCC’s identified mitigation at the junction of A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane being delivered.

4.4 What are the prospects of improvements in highway and transport infrastructure being delivered so that housing and other needs can be fully met?

2.23 Over the recent past, a number of highway improvement works have taken place which will improve the highway network and the highway capacity in Wyre. These improvements include but are not limited to: the Broughton Bypass, the Preston Western Distributor; improvements at Junction 2 of M55; Junction 1 of M55 improvements; Cottam link, East West link road and Windy Harbour Skippool improvements. A number of recently permitted schemes are also delivering highway improvements works through S.278 works. As such, highway improvement works can be delivered to improve the capacity and functionality of the network.

2.24 Notwithstanding our concerns in relation to the Council’s evidence base and justification for diverging away from meeting their full OAHN, we consider that additional highway improvements could be delivered through developer obligations on allocated sites. TW and their highway consultants (Curtins) consider that appropriate mitigation measures could be put in place to mitigate the impact associated with the delivery of sufficient houses to meet the Council’s full OAHN.

2.25 WBC should take a proactive approach to the delivery of their full housing and employment needs and seek to identify and deliver the required infrastructure improvements to facilitate this need.

4.6 Would a different distribution of development avoid severe highway impacts and allow the LP to meet housing needs?

2.26 TW are of the opinion that the highway capacity issues outlined by the Council are overstated and sufficient capacity exists within the network to facilitate the delivery of the Council’s full OAHN. Notwithstanding, the Council has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that
they have explored a variety of spatial distribution scenarios to assess whether the full housing need over the plan period could be accommodated.

2.27 A variety of distribution scenarios should have been modelled in the Council’s highway evidence to demonstrate that meeting the full housing need would result in severe impacts from a highway capacity and highway safety perspective.

2.28 If the Council’s highway capacity concerns are found to have some merit, TW considers that the Council should seek to prioritise development in the most sustainable higher order settlements which have the best public transport network, access to services, facilities and employment opportunities, and reduce the propensity and necessity for trips via private vehicles. Under the current settlement hierarchy distribution of development, the urban towns and Key Service Centre are expected to deliver just 58% of the housing growth with the remaining 42% being directly to the lower order rural settlements. Given the perceived highway capacity concerns, the Council should have sought to direct proportionately more growth toward the Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements with access to the best modes of public transport and service provision to encourage a modal shift.

2.29 However, the Council should also have modelled the impact of delivering additional growth in these settlements and quantify the upper level of growth the settlements could accommodate without causing a severe impact on the local highway network.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Introduction
1.1.1 Curtins has been appointed on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to provide traffic and transportation advice to support representations to the Wyre Local Plan process.

1.2 Background
1.2.1 Future development within Wyre will be guided by the plans and policies within Wyre’s emerging new Local Plan. This will set out a vision for growth and development of the entire borough to 2031, including where new homes, employment and shops will be located, as well as which areas are to be protected.

1.2.2 The Draft of the Local Plan is currently being prepared for public examination which is due to commence in May 2018.

1.2.3 Taylor Wimpey is promoting Site SA1/16 – West of Cockerham Road, Garstang, which is included within the emerging Local Plan as a housing allocation (for up to 100 dwellings). Taylor Wimpey is also promoting land to the north and west of the allocation for a further circa 150 dwellings as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site.

Figure 1 – Site SA1/16
Garstang remains ranked in the settlement hierarchy as a 2nd tier Key Service Centre, the only one in the Borough, with just 10% of the planned growth apportioned to it. This proposed scale of housing in Garstang has been largely influenced by highway capacity studies undertaken by Lancashire County Council [LCC]. LCC considered that Garstang would not be able to accommodate any further housing growth beyond what has currently been granted planning consent due to highway constraints along the A6 corridor and Junction of M55.

This view comes from a document LCC published in February 2017, titled “Implications for Housing Developments within the Proposed Wyre Local Plan”. This document was prepared in conjunction with Highways England and sought to provide an initial strategic view on the impact of the Local Plan housing projections on highway capacity.

Curtins has been instructed to consider whether the traffic and transport infrastructure in the area could accommodate the proposed additional land at Cockerham Road, Garstang for a further 150 dwellings.

**Purpose of this Report**

This note is intended to provide high level evidence which demonstrates that Garstang is a sustainable location and there is capacity, or the opportunity to increase capacity through committed infrastructure improvements, on the Strategic Road Network and Local Highway Network.
2.0 Planning History

2.1 **Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/A/16/3142267**

2.1.1 Following the decision by Wyre Borough Council to refuse the original planning application (App Ref: 14/00458/OULMAJ) in November 2015 in relation to an outline application for the erection of up to 270 dwellings, 4.68ha of land for employment (B1 and B8) uses, convenience store (up to 375sqm sales area) and coffee shop (up to 2356sqm sales area) the decision was successfully appealed by the applicant (J Chippendale Limited) following a Public Inquiry.

2.1.2 The application relates to 16.6ha of land that is located immediately to the south of Site SA1/16 which incorporates the A6 to the east and is bound by Croston Barn Lane to the north, the Lancaster Canal to the south and Nateby Crossing Lane to the west.

2.1.3 The approved mixed-use scheme will provide a number of residential dwellings as well employment and complementary retail services that would benefit the surrounding area.

2.1.4 The proximity of the approved site to Site SA1/16 is highlighted as a sustainability benefit within the Wyre Local Plan 2017 Site Allocations Background Paper which recognises that the proposals will deliver additional retail and employment opportunities directly opposite the site.

2.1.5 The application was considered acceptable by the Lancashire County Council Highways (LCC) subject to the delivery of a package of S278 highway works and S106 developer contributions towards wider infrastructure works. It is evident that the local highway network in the immediate vicinity of the site could accommodate, or can be improved, to develop a large-scale development opportunity within Garstang.

2.1.6 As an adjacent site, Site SA1/16 and surrounding land can benefit from the committed highway infrastructure works as well as the potential vehicle reductions that the proximity to new retail and employment opportunities provides.

2.1.7 The primary vehicular access to the site would be taken from the A6 via a new four arm roundabout which would be delivered as part of the realignment of the A6 carriageway.

2.1.8 Two further vehicular access points would be created on Nateby Crossing Lane serving residential accommodation. It is also proposed that a pedestrian/cycle link to Garstang town centre would be created along the existing, disused railway line under the A6.

2.1.9 There were a number of key statements made by the Planning Inspector that will have implications on any further planning applications submitted in the local area in the future.
2.1.10 The most pertinent of which is that it was agreed that the scheme should be considered in isolation citing that:

- Pending applications are neither committed or formally allocated; and
- Highways England and LCC have developed a series of highway improvements to address the anticipated shortfall in highway capacity.

2.1.11 A package of pedestrian/cycle improvements, speed limit reviews and capacity improvements along the A6 corridor has been developed by LCC and it was concluded that whilst local junctions would operate above capacity on occasions, the LCC proposals (to be delivered via s278) will assist matters in terms of both safety and operation.

2.1.12 On this basis, the Inspector concluded that there would be no severe residual cumulative impact.

2.1.13 Whilst highway safety and operation is a key consideration in the surrounding area, the Planning Inspector concluded that the site is situated in a sustainable location. It can therefore be considered that the Cockerham Road site, as an immediately adjacent site, is also in a sustainable location.
3.0 Highways England

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Highways England (HE) is responsible for the management and maintenance of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) across the UK. In the vicinity of the site, this includes the M55 motorway and more specifically, Junction 1 of the M55.

3.1.2 The LCC report includes an overview of the quantum of development that is considered deliverable across the borough. As part of this process the study refers to ‘congestion on known strategic pinch points’ and makes reference to the M55 Junction 1. The overarching factor restricting development along much of the A6 is capacity constraints at the M55 Junction 1.

3.1.3 To the east of the Borough, the A6 provides connectivity between Garstang and the rural areas and the M6 and Preston. From the A6 there is no direct access to the M6 south of Junction 33 and instead a key access point is via Junction 1 of the M55. This contributes to congestion which exists in the Broughton area and at Junction 1 which also has significant implications for travel into Preston.

3.1.4 The idea/suggestion of a new motorway junction between junctions 32 and 33 of the M6 has been the subject of successive approaches from Wyre Borough Council to Highways England. Highways England has consistently cited policy as a reason which would preclude a new motorway junction in this general location, on a principal section of the national motorway network, to serve primarily local journeys.

3.1.5 LCC separately has pointed to the considerable costs of introducing a new junction in this area, partly due to the close proximity of the West Coast Main Line and Lancaster Canal along large sections of the A6-M6 route. At present there are policy, engineering (local and strategic highway networks) and financial/delivery obstacles that result in a new junction being not considered viable. Therefore, the addition of a new junction within this plan period is unlikely and has not been considered as part of the strategic assessments.

3.1.6 On the above basis, this section of the report considers Junction 1 in more detail.

3.2 M55 Junction 1 Operation

3.2.1 LCC has carried out detailed operation and capacity review of the M55 Junction 1 with support from HE. The review included new traffic data and considered committed development and other influencing development/proposals, including that from Wyre, Ribble Valley, Preston, Preston City Councils Local Plan (supported by LCC), a new motorway junction on the M55 (J2), Preston Western Distributor (PWD) and other highway infrastructure/changes.
3.2.2 The review and modelling exercise demonstrated that there will be some limited capacity on the A6 at M55 Junction 1, subject to delivery of the following elements:

- Slip road improvements at Junction 1 on HE network. In isolation, this improvement can only support some limited development, previous statutory comments accepted the impacts of Nateby Crossing Lane application and its financial contribution.
- PWD, M55 Jct.2 (approved October 2017) and associated measures.
- Other highway linkages yet to be provided by development currently being built out i.e. land north of Eastway.

3.2.3 LCC acknowledge that the new Junction 2 will provide some relief to Junction 1 as northwest Preston traffic will utilise Junction 2. An internal road through the D’urton Lane/Eastway development north of Preston will provide a route linking D’urton Lane (near Broughton Bypass) to Eastway. This will deliver an alternative route bypassing Junction 1 of the M55 for light vehicles. The new Junction 2 will also provide some relief to Junction 3 of the M55 which will release capacity for further development opportunities elsewhere within the Borough.

3.2.4 Since the completion of LCC’s review, the Broughton Bypass is now operational (as of October 2017). Further discussions with LCC has confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined. The intention is to allow the traffic conditions to stabilise before any collecting further data and undertaking a more comprehensive review.

3.2.5 In summary, the junction does experience some queuing and congestion but this is not unusual for a motorway junction during traditional peak hours. LCC has confirmed that following identified improvements Junction 1 of the M55 can accommodate further development traffic.

3.2.6 LCC suggest that the assessments are purely desktop based and not supported by a detailed Transport Assessment that future applications will need to provide.

3.2.7 It is LCC’s position that “individual sites brought forward would be done so on their own merits and require a satisfactory detailed transport assessment/statement.”

3.3 Preston Western Distributor

3.3.1 In addition to the above improvements, the Preston Western Distributor (PWD) was approved on the 4th October 2017 (App Ref: LCC/2016/0046) under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 by Lancashire County Council. This is a major £109 million package of highway improvements which can broadly be described as a new 4.3km dual carriageway linking the A583 at Lea to the M55 at Bartle with a new motorway junction. The East West Link Road which forms part of the wider scheme would be a 3.4km long single carriageway road linking Lightfoot Lane to the
PWD, with segregated foot and cycle ways along its full length. Curtins understand that funding has been secured for the delivery of the PWD and it is scheduled to be completed by 2021.

3.3.2 A plan of the highway improvements is included below:

**Preston Western Distributor and East West Link Road**

![Figure 3 - PWD](image)

3.3.3 The Environmental Statement prepared by LCC to support the scheme has been obtained from the Planning Portal and a review of this reveals significant benefits are predicted on the LRN and SRN.
3.3.4 The scheme would alleviate traffic congestion at key points on the local and strategic highway network and provide direct access to existing housing in North West Preston and Cottam. Further benefits are stated as follows;

- Provide relief to peak hour congestion for east west journeys using Preston City Centre,
- Enable delivery of priority sustainable transport measures with improvements for walking, cycling and public transport.
- Improved access and journey times to the motorway network from the Enterprise Zone at Warton,
- Support delivery of a proposed Cottam Parkway railway station,

3.3.5 It is anticipated that Junction 1 of the M55 is expected to benefit from noticeable reductions in traffic as a result of the implementation of the PWD.

3.4 Summary

3.4.1 To summarise, the M55 Junction 1 is currently operating within theoretical capacity, albeit some arms operate over capacity during the traditional AM and PM peak periods.

3.4.2 To alleviate congestion at the junction, LCC and HE have identified a package of improvements which would provide additional capacity to deliver future development.

3.4.3 Furthermore, the junction is expected to benefit from the Preston Western Distributor road and Broughton Bypass.

3.4.4 It is therefore concluded that the existing allocation could be increased and the M55 Junction 1 is not the key constraint that the LCC reports suggests it is.

3.4.5 It is noted that any future planning application would be supported by a detailed Transport Assessment that will include baseline traffic data to support the traffic impact assessment and determine the overall impact that further residential development within Garstang will have on the local and strategic highway network.
4.0 Local Highway Network

4.1 Implications on the Local Highway Network

4.1.1 Lancashire County Council is responsible for the Local Road Network (LRN) in Garstang.

4.1.2 It is anticipated that any future development of the Garstang site would be accessed via Cockerham Road. The B5272 Cockerham Road extends on a north/south alignment and has a width of approximately 8.5m in the vicinity of the proposed site. The highway is subject to the National Speed Limit throughout.

4.1.3 The A6 Preston – Lancaster Road runs to the east of the site and is a single lane two-way carriageway with a width of approximately 9m in the vicinity of the site including cycle lane provision. The highway is subject to various speed limits in different locations along the length of the road. Through Garstang, the A6 is subject to a speed limit of 50mph.

4.1.4 Croston Barn Lane runs on a west-east alignment and has a width of approximately 5.5m in the vicinity of the site. The highway is subject to the National Speed Limit throughout, and there are no parking restrictions along the road in the vicinity of the proposed site. Nateby Crossing Lane runs to the west of the site and is a single carriageway two-way road. The highway is subject to the National Speed Limit throughout.

4.1.5 It is noted that the key issue that is affecting the decision making process is the cumulative traffic impact at Junction 1 of the M55 which is situated over 13.5km to the south of Garstang.

4.1.6 Any future planning applications would need to be supported by a Transport Assessment which will identify impact at local junctions. LCC has developed a package of improvement measures that recently approved schemes will be required to contribute towards in order to mitigate traffic impact on the local highway network. These schemes include;

4.1.7 Initiative 1 – A6 Barton to Garstang Sustainable Transport Strategy. This scheme will deliver improvement of Pedestrian and Cycle Provision in the A6 Corridor, in particular:

    i. Provide continuous cycle lanes along the full length, achieved through carriageway widening, central hatching narrowing and coloured surfacing as appropriate.

    ii. Provide traffic islands or refuge islands in central hatched area. This will help regulate speeds and provide improved crossing places.

    iii. Use of Gateway features to emphasise village entry points.

    iv. Use of red textureflex sparingly but also continuously where required.
v. A review to declutter and resign as appropriate.

vi. Speed limit review to lower to 40mph or 30 where appropriate.

vii. Review of Bus stops in the corridor and improvements (to QBS) as Appropriate

4.1.8 This strategy can be delivered in a number of phases/smaller packages of improvement works that can be delivered through contributions from all major developments with an impact in the corridor, in line with the CIL tests.

4.1.9 Initiative 2 – Wider Improvement of A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Croston Barn Road/Green Lane West/B5272 Cockerham Road/Croston Road Signalised Junction The scheme includes an upgrade to MOVA operation and the provision of pedestrian/cycle facilities throughout the junction.

4.1.10 Initiative 3 – Improvement of Moss Lane/Longmoor Lane Priority Junction. The scheme includes improvements for pedestrians and cyclists and other safety measures.

4.1.11 Initiative 4 – Improvement of A6/A586, ‘The Avenue’ priority junction. The scheme includes full signalisation, pedestrian and cycle, speed reduction and other safety measures.
5.0 Wyre Council – Site Allocations Background Paper-Sept 2017

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 It is acknowledged by Wyre Council that whilst the capacity along the A6 corridor, notably Junction 1 of the M55, restricts future development opportunities there is currently permitted capacity for up 858 dwellings. This is based on 10 recent planning decisions in 2017, 9 of which were granted planning consent and a single application for 183 dwellings is subject to a planning appeal.

5.1.2 Notwithstanding the outcome of the future planning appeal, Wyre Council have concluded that there is capacity to allocate land for 183 dwellings along the A6 corridor.

5.1.3 Annex A – A6 Review of the Site Allocations Background Paper sets out the Councils methodology for identifying the most sustainable site(s) capable of accommodating 183 dwellings and are currently available for allocation in the Wyre Local Plan. The masterplan area being promoted by Taylor Wimpey has been identified as a suitable location that could take up this capacity.

5.2 Identification of Site SA1/16

5.2.1 The A6 Review confirms that Garstang is the largest settlement in the rural part of the borough and is ranked highest of all the settlements that were considered.

5.2.2 It goes on to state that Garstang has a wide range of services and facilities, with relatively good health and social infrastructure including a medical centre, pharmacy, dentists, three primary schools, a library, recreation provision, numerous pubs, several village and community halls and five churches. The nearest secondary school is Garstang Community Academy 2km to the south on the A6 at Bowgreave and accessible by bus. There is therefore a high degree of choice within the service and facility offer.

5.2.3 Garstang is clearly considered to be a highly sustainable settlement which is capable of accommodating further residential development and is justifiably identified by Wyre Council as the main focus for future sites.

5.2.4 Site SA1/16 is a collection of three sites with a combined site area of 5.81ha that Wyre Council believe could accommodate 100 dwellings. It is defined as a sustainably located site which provides the opportunity to develop new educational infrastructure alongside new housing development in an area close to a proposed development of housing and employment uses.

5.2.5 As a preferred site option, Wyre Council accepts at Table AA/7 (Annex A) that the site “offers the potential for a comprehensive development with no significant constraints and reasonable accessibility to services and facilities.”
5.3 Conclusion

5.3.1 It can be concluded that Garstang is a sustainable location which is capable of accommodating future residential development.

5.3.2 Whilst Wyre Councils review looked to identify potential locations for 183 dwellings it is noted that this is based on recent planning decisions which may or may not be delivered within the plan period.

5.3.3 There could therefore be additional capacity to deliver further housing within the preferred sites.
6.0 Accessibility of Garstang

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 One of the key elements of national and local planning policy is to ensure that new developments are located in areas which are sustainable and where alternative modes of travel are available. Developments should not be isolated but should instead be located close to complementary land uses. Encouraging the integration of planning and transport supports the aim of reducing overall travel and use of private car.

6.1.2 Whilst the Garstang settlement area has already been defined by Wyre Council as a sustainable location, this section of the report considers the accessibility of Garstang and demonstrates that it is a suitable and sustainable place to locate new development.

6.2 Pedestrian Accessibility

6.2.1 The site adjoins the existing settlement boundary and developed area of Garstang, and lies within direct and convenient access of a wide range of local community facilities and services including, but not limited to, the following:

- The Co-Operative Foodstore;
- Booths Foodstore;
- Sainsburys Foodstore;
- Garstang Community Primary School;
- Garstang St Thomas Church of England Primary School;
- St Thomas’ Church
- The Bellflower and Th’Owd Tithe Barn public houses;
- Post Office;
- Hair Salons;
- GP Surgeries; and
- Dental Practice.

6.2.2 The allocation site has access to existing pedestrian infrastructure with Cockerham Road offering footways on the eastern side of the highway.

6.2.3 There is existing pedestrian infrastructure along surrounding roads with the A6 Preston – Lancaster Road, Croston Road and Green Lane West including features such as sheltered bus stops, pedestrian crossings including dropped kerbs and tactile paving.

6.2.4 The accessibility of local services has been considered in terms of their accessibility within a 500m, 1,000m and 2,000m walk of the site centre, corresponding to the “desirable”, “acceptable” and
“preferred maximum” distances suggested by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT).

6.2.5 Within 500m desirable walking distance there is employment opportunities at Garstang Fire Station and Burlington Park (Holiday Park), in addition to Green Lane Veterinary Centre and various services within the industrial facilities located along Green Lane West.

6.2.6 Within 1,000m acceptable walking distance there are a number of facilities including Garstang YMCA Swimming Pool, Garstang Community Primary School, numerous food outlets and various small independent stores all located south east of the site.

6.2.7 To the east of the site there is Wyre Vale Holiday Park and Acresfield Health Club and Spa.

6.2.8 Within 2,000m maximum walking distance there is Garstang Canoe and Kayak Club, Garstang Football Club, Hudson Park, Garstang Post Office, a food retail store located south east of the site.

6.2.9 South of the site is the town centre of Garstang which has facilities such as banks, estate agents, Garstang Library and Leisure Centre as well as hairdresser, garden centre and Garstang Free Methodist Church located within it for users of the site to access on foot. There are also other restaurant/bars/pubs located south of the site and Garstang Saint Thomas’ CE Primary School and St Thomas’s Church.

6.3 Cycle Accessibility

6.3.1 In order to assist in assessing the accessibility of the site by cycle, an 8km cycle catchment has been considered for the site. The 8km cycling distance refers to a recommendation by Cycling England in the document 'Integrating Cycling into Development Proposals' (2009).

6.3.2 The catchment extends as far as Cockerham in the north, Calder Vale to the east, Bilsborrow in the south and Stake Pool to the west.

6.3.3 There is a local route that runs along the Lancaster Canal south of the site and National Cycle Route 6 is located approximately 2,000m east of the site and runs close to the M6 motorway. It runs from Watford to Windermere passing through Manchester, Sheffield and Leicester.

6.3.4 It is noted that there are numerous employment opportunities within Garstang and some further afield that are within the noted 8km catchment.

6.4 Bus Accessibility

6.4.1 The nearest bus stop to the site is located approximately 400m south east of the site on Croston Road. Table 5.1 details the services that call at these stops, and their associated frequencies:
Bus Service | Route | Peak Hourly Frequency
--- | --- | ---
41 | Morecambe - Lancaster - Garstang - Preston | Hourly | Hourly | -

Table 6.1 – Bus services and frequencies from Croston Road

6.4.2 The services that run via Croston Road provide access to and from the site to a number of locations in and around the Central Lancashire area such as Morecambe, Lancaster and Preston, again which provide connections to various employment opportunities within Lancashire.

6.4.3 Further bus stops are located slightly further away from the site and offer more services to different destinations. Table 5.2 details the services that call at the stop on the B6430 Lancaster Road, approximately 700m east of the proposed site access, and their associated frequencies. It is also noted that these buses serve educational institutions such as Lancaster University and University of Cumbria in Lancaster, as well as local schools such as Garstang Community Academy, Preston College Campus and Runshaw College.

| Bus Service | Route | Peak Hourly Frequency
--- | --- | ---
40 | Morecambe - Lancaster - Garstang - Preston | 2 per hour | 2 per hour | 1 per hour
40A | Lancaster - Garstang – Preston College Campus | 1 in AM | N/A | N/A
40B | Lancaster – Garstang High School | 1 in AM | N/A | N/A
42 | Blackpool – Poulton-le-Fylde — Catterall – Garstang – Lancaster - Morecambe | 1 per hour | 1 per hour | 1 per hour
512 | Garstang High School – Scorton – Dolphinholme | 1 in AM | 1 in PM | N/A
544 | Preesall – Stake Pool – Garstang - Galgate | 1 in AM | 1 in PM | N/A
651 | Garstang – Bilsborrow – Broughton – Fulwood – Our Ladys High School | 1 in AM | 2 in PM | N/A
715 | Garstang – Catterall – Broughton – Runshaw College | 1 in AM | 1 in PM | N/A
940 | Preston – Garstang – Lancaster Boys Grammar School | 1 in AM | 1 in PM | N/A
941 | Preston – Garstang – Lancaster Girls Grammar School | 1 in AM | 1 in PM | N/A
942 | Garstang – Galgate – Lancaster University - Lancaster | 1 in AM | 1 in PM | N/A

Table 6.2 – Bus services and frequencies from B6430 Lancaster Road
6.5 Settlement Hierarchy

6.5.1 Garstang remains ranked in the settlement hierarchy as a 2nd tier Key Service Centre, the only one in the Borough, with just 10% of the planned growth apportioned to it.

6.5.2 Whilst highway safety and operation is a key consideration in the surrounding area, at a recent planning appeal the Planning Inspector concluded that the site is situated in a sustainable location. It can therefore be considered that the Cockerham Road site, as an immediately adjacent site, is also in a sustainable location.

6.6 Summary

6.6.1 It is clear from the Council’s own settlement hierarchy and the LCC report that Garstang is well located to benefit from sustainable modes of travel and existing local services. This differentiates the settlements from many other locations and on the basis that there is a genuine alternative to car travel, or facilities which reduce the need to travel, it is considered that the housing allocation could be increased.
7.0 Highway Impact Assessment

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This section of the report assesses the impact of the proposed development on the highway network. As previously stated, Taylor Wimpey is promoting Site SA1/16 which is allocated in the emerging plan for 100 dwellings and land to the north of the allocation for 150 dwellings.

7.2 Wider Highway Network Impact

7.2.1 The Wyre Local Plan sets out that the housing need for Wyre over the period 2011-2031 is 9,580 however the LPA on the advice of LCC as the Highway Authority considers that only 8,224 dwellings can be delivered due to highway capacity constraints, hence a shortfall of 1,356. It is Curtins understanding that 1,646 dwellings have already been delivered over the period 2011/12 - 2015/16.

7.2.2 As detailed in Section 3 of this note, LCC has prepared a comprehensive document to assess the capacity of the highway network to accommodate indicative developments within Wyre. The study identifies M55 Junction 1 as the overarching factor restricting development along the A6 corridor.

7.2.3 Since the completion of LCC’s review, the Broughton Bypass is now operational (as of October 2017). Further discussions with LCC has confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined, however onsite observations confirm noticeable improvements in previously identified issues.

7.2.4 LCC have also confirmed that there is scope for additional development due to current benefits from the Broughton Bypass, however the intention is to allow the traffic conditions to stabilise before collecting further data and undertaking a more comprehensive review to establish this.

7.2.5 In addition to the above, the PWD was also approved in October 2017. It is anticipated that Junction 1 of the M55 will benefit from noticeable reductions in traffic as a result of the implementation of the PWD.

7.2.6 It is important to note that the shortfall of 1356 dwellings between the OAHN and the Local Plan equates to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database). This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts at any single junction or link.

7.2.7 It has been demonstrated in the previous section that that the LCC review did not fully take into account major highway improvements that were planned in the area when considering future capacities. LCC also acknowledge that there is scope for future development to utilise traffic capacity of potential developments that have been considered as part of their own analysis that may not be delivered or approved at planning for any reason.
It is also worth noting that any future planning application for all the developments assessed would be accompanied by a Travel Plan. This will include a package of measures to encourage travel by sustainable modes and reduce single occupancy car journeys, thereby benefiting the operation of the highway network.

On the above basis it is considered that LCC’s assessment of the highway capacity is overly cautious and that there is scope to deliver further development without having a severe impact on the highway network.

In addition to the above, capacity assessments of key junctions along the A6 corridor has been undertaken to demonstrate the impact of the delivery of the full housing need of 9,580 dwellings over the period to 2031 and is detailed below.

For the purpose of this assessment, the total dwellings being promoted by Taylor Wimpey are identified as the development scenario. Approved developments and developments going through planning as well those identified within the Local Plan are referred to as committed development.

### Scope of Assessment

The following junctions has been considered as part of the study area;

- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Lancaster Road
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane (To be upgraded to MOVA operation and improvements to pedestrian/cycle facilities);
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Longmoor Lane/Moss Lane;
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/A586 The Avenue (to be signalised);
- A6 Garstang Road/Woodplumpton Lane/Whittingham Lane (Broughton Crossroads); and
- Junction 1, M55

Traffic surveys for the above junctions were undertaken by the independent survey company MHC on 6th June 2017 for the AM (0700-1000) and PM (1500-1800) peak periods.

Assessment of the above survey traffic confirmed that the AM peak is 0730-0830 and PM peak 1645-1745. The AM and PM peak hour survey traffic is presented in Traffic Figures 01 and 02.

It is important to note that no further assessments of the A6 Garstang Road/Woodplumpton Lane/Whittingham Lane (Broughton Crossroads); and Junction 1, M55 due to the implementation of the Broughton Bypass. Onsite observation indicate that all the initial issues identified at these junctions have been alleviated.
### 7.4 Committed Development

#### 7.4.1 The committed developments considered in the assessments are detail in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed Development</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00891 Garstang Golf Club</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>95 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00040 Bowgreave House Farm</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>30 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00053 Kepple Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>75 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00266 Kepple Lane (Utopia)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>130 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00248 Joe Lane</td>
<td>Residential + Commercial</td>
<td>200 units, 42 appts, village centre and family pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00681 Daniel Fold Farm</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>122 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/00353 Stubbins Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>44 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00072 Garstang Road (Avonhurst)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>29 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/2015/0306 639 Garstang Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>49 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00928 Calder House Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>45 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00625 Garstang Road (south of Shepherds Farm)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>72 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00955 Collinson PLC</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>6,000sqm extension to existing estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>891 Units and 42 apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developments currently going through Planning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/00420 Garstang Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>46 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/00928 Calder House Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>45 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00144 Daniel Fold Lane</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>66 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00241 Nateby Crossing</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>269 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00090 867 Garstang Road (Rostock Dairy)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>26 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/00807 Shepherds Farm</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>34 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/00743 Westfield Farm Retirement Village, Garstang</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>200 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>686 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1– Committed Development

7.4.2 Table 7.1 confirms that there is a total of 891 houses and 42 apartments approved as committed development with 686 houses currently going through the planning system. Overall 1577 houses and 42 apartments have been considered as committed residential development.

7.4.3 The AM and PM committed development traffic is illustrated in Traffic Figures 3 and 4 for the AM and PM peak.
7.5 **Traffic Growth**

7.5.1 The TEMPro database has been used to derive local growth factors for the plan year 2031. TEMPro is a program developed by the Department for Transport (DfT) providing traffic growth projections used in transport models and intended to act as a nationwide standardised distribution of growth in trip ends.

7.5.2 The datasets used in TEMPRO are long-term forecasts and they represent the DfT’s best estimate of the long-term response to demographic and economic trends based on information from the Census data and UK Commission for Skills and Employment etc.

7.5.3 Information about planned dwellings is derived from LPA plans and monitoring reports and based on targets/plans for the whole control area (Local Authority).

7.5.4 The growth factors are detailed as follows:

- AM Peak- 1.0873; and
- PM Peak – 1.0808.

7.5.5 The above growth factors have been applied to the survey traffic to obtain the 2031 background traffic flows and is presented in Traffic Figures 5 and 6 for the AM and PM peaks respectively.

7.5.6 The committed development traffic has been added to the 2031 background traffic to obtain the 2031 base with development traffic and is illustrated in Traffic Figures 7 and 8 for the AM and PM peak.

7.6 **Trip Generation**

7.6.1 In order to generate trip rates for the Taylor Wimpey residential development, the TRICS database has been interrogated. TRICS is the industry recognised tool for calculating the anticipated future trip demand of a proposed development. The database contains multi-modal surveys of varying land uses in multiple destinations across the UK including residential uses.

7.6.2 To derive the potential trip rates associated with the Taylor Wimpey development, the ‘Residential’ category of the TRICS database has been interrogated using the following criteria:

- Houses Privately Owned excluding sites in Greater London and Ireland; and
- Sites located in ‘Edge of Town’ or ‘Suburban Areas’.

7.6.3 Section 6 of this report demonstrates that the site is highly accessible by sustainable modes of travel and therefore it is considered that average trip rates would be representative when deriving the potential vehicle trips associated with the proposed development.

7.6.4 Table 7.2 below summarises the trip rates and subsequent vehicle trips associated with each phase of the proposed development.
### Table 7.2 - Trip Generation Based on TRICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>Departures</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Arrivals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip Rates</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Units</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Units</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -250 Units</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 confirms that the allocated 100 units will generate 56 two-way movements in both the AM and PM peak periods with the additional 150 units generating 84 two-way movements. It also shows that the 250 units would generate a total 140 two-way movements during both the AM and PM peak periods.

### Trip Distribution

#### 7.7.1 Distribution

Distribution of the above traffic onto the surrounding highway network has been calculated using journey to work information. This involves the use of 2011 Census ‘Journey to Work’ Data and is broadly summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage of Traffic (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 1</td>
<td>A586</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2</td>
<td>Longmoor Lane</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>Croston Road</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 4</td>
<td>Moss Lane</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 5</td>
<td>A6 south</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 6</td>
<td>M55 east</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 8</td>
<td>A6 north</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 9</td>
<td>B5269</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 – Trip Distribution Based on 2011 Census Data

The traffic distribution for the development traffic is illustrated in Traffic Figure 9. The development traffic shown in Table 7.2 has been assigned to the highway network using the above distribution. The
proposed development traffic for the 250 units is presented in Traffic Figures 10 and 11 for the AM and PM peak. The 2031 base with committed development has been added to the proposed development traffic to obtain the 2031 base with committed plus development traffic. This is presented in Traffic Figure 12 and 13.

7.7.3 All traffic figures are provided in Appendix A.

7.8 Junction Capacity Assessments

7.8.1 The following junctions have been assessed using junction modelling packages as indicated below:

- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Lancaster Road - PICADY
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane - LinSig;
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Longmoor Lane/Moss Lane - PICADY;
- A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/A586 The Avenue - LinSig;

7.8.2 The above junctions have been assessed for both the base and base with development scenarios to determine the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network. The assessments have been undertaken using Junctions 8 (ARCADY and PICADY) and LINSIG. The modelling output can be provided if required.

Interpretation of Model Outputs

LINSIG

7.8.3 The signal controlled junctions under consideration have been assessed using LinSig. LinSig results refer to the Degree of Saturation (DoS) and Mean Maximum Queue (MMQ) predicted in each lane of the junction. A DoS of 100% indicates that the lane in question is operating at its theoretical capacity (point of saturation), whilst a DoS of 90% or less indicates that the lane is operating within its Practical Reserve Capacity.

ARCADY and PICADY

7.8.4 All ARCADY’s and PICADY’s have been undertaken using Junctions 8 modelling package. Results refer to the Ratio of Flow to Capacity (RFC) and queue length predicted on each arm of the junction. An RFC of 1.00 indicates that the arm in question is operating at its theoretical capacity, whilst an RFC of 0.85 or less indicates that the arm is operating within its practical capacity.

Junction 1 – A6 Preston Lancaster Road/B6340

7.8.5 Analysis of the junction has been undertaken using PICADY, and the results are summarised in Table 6.1:
Table 7.4 – A6 Preston Road Capacity Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DoS</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base + Committed Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6430 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base + Committed Development + Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6430 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Lancaster Road</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.8.6 The results demonstrate that the junction operates within capacity for the AM peak in the base with committed development scenario for both the AM and PM peak. The results also confirm that the junction will continue to operate within capacity during both the AM and PM peak when the development traffic is added.

7.8.7 A comparison of the base with committed and the development scenario shows no material increase in capacity or queuing. On the above basis it is considered that the impact of the proposed development and the residual impact of all the developments identified in the local plan on the local highway network is not severe.

**Longmoor Lane/Moss Lane/A6**

7.8.8 Analysis of the junction has been undertaken using PICADY, and the results are summarised in Table 7.5:

Table 7.5 – Longmoor Lane/A6/Moss Lane Capacity Assessment Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DoS</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Lane</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmoor Lane</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development+ Dev</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Lane</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longmoor Lane</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.5 shows that the junction operates within capacity in both the AM and PM base for the committed/plan development scenario. The results also demonstrate that with the addition of the proposed development traffic the junction will continue to operate with spare capacity.

It is clear from the results that there is no material change in capacity and queues when the plan scenario is compared with the development scenario. It is therefore considered that the impact of the development is not severe at this junction.

**A6/A586 The Avenue**

This junction has been used assessed using LinSig and the results are summarised in Table 7.6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DoS</td>
<td>MMQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Ahead</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Right</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 South Ahead Left</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A586 The Avenue Left Right</td>
<td>70.1 : 70.1%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed +Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Ahead</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 North Right</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 South Ahead Left</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A586 The Avenue Left Right</td>
<td>73.9 : 73.9%</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results demonstrate that this junction operates with spare capacity during both the AM and PM peak base with committed/plan development scenario for the future year 2031. Also with the addition of the proposed development traffic the junction will continue to operate within spare capacity.

A comparison of the base with committed/plan scenario with the development scenario results confirms slight increase in queuing on all arms of the junction. This is likely to be imperceptible to existing road users and therefore not considered to be severe.

**A6 Preston New Road/Cockerham Lane/Croston Barn Lane/Green Lane West**

Table 7.7 summarises the LinSig results for this junction.
Table 7.7 confirms that the junction operates within capacity in the AM peak for both the base with committed development scenario and the base with development scenario.

For the PM peak the results demonstrate that the A6 south arm operates at practical capacity but well within its theoretical capacity in the base with committed/plan development scenario. When the development traffic is added the results confirm that the junction will operate above its practical capacity but within theoretical capacity.

As previously stated, LCC has identified this junction as requiring improvement as part of the wider improvements along the A6 corridor. The scheme includes upgrading the junction to MOVA operation and the provision of pedestrian/cycle facilities throughout the junction.

It is Curtins view that the implementation of the proposed improvements will improve the current operation of the junction and minimise any potential impact of the committed/plan development as well as the proposed development.

On the above basis it is considered that the impact of the proposals on this junction is not severe.
7.9 **Summary**

7.9.1 The assessments demonstrate that there would be additional 84 two-way movements in both the AM and PM peak as a result of the additional 150 dwellings. The capacity assessments confirm that the additional 150 dwellings can be accommodated without causing a severe impact on the surrounding highway network.

7.9.2 The shortfall of 1356 dwellings equate to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database). This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts.

7.9.3 LCC did not fully take into account major highway improvements that were planned in the area when considering future capacities. The opening of the Broughton Bypass has been operational since October 2017. Further discussions with LCC have confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined but it is clear from on site observations that some of the earlier issues have been alleviated.

7.9.4 It is considered that major highway improvements should be fully considered.

7.9.5 The above assessments demonstrate that LCC’s position on the highway constraints is overstated. LCC also acknowledge that there is scope for future development to utilise traffic capacity of potential developments that have been considered as part of their own analysis that may not be delivered or approved at planning for any reason and therefore would need to be considered on first come first served basis.

7.9.6 Any future planning application for the site will also include a travel plan to encourage travel by sustainable modes and reduce the reliance on private car journeys providing opportunity for further development.
8.0 Conclusions

8.1.1 Curtins has been appointed on behalf of Taylor Wimpey to provide traffic and transportation advice to support representations to the Wyre Local Plan process.

8.1.2 Taylor Wimpey is promoting Site SA1/16 – West of Cockerham Road, Garstang, which is included within the emerging Local Plan as a housing allocation (for up to 100 dwellings). Taylor Wimpey is also promoting land to the north and west of the allocation for a further circa 150 dwellings.

8.1.3 The Council’s own settlement hierarchy and the LCC report that Garstang is well located to benefit from sustainable modes of travel and existing local services. This differentiates the settlements from many other locations and on the basis that there is a genuine alternative to car travel, or facilities which reduce the need to travel, it is considered that the housing allocation could be increased.

8.1.4 It is noted that the key issue that is affecting the decision-making process is the cumulative traffic impact at Junction 1 of the M55 which is situated over 13.5km to the south of Garstang. In addition to a package of measures identified by the HE and the LCC to improve traffic flow at this junction, it is expected to benefit from the Preston Western Distributor road and Broughton Bypass.

8.1.5 The Broughton Bypass has been operational since October 2017. Further discussions with LCC have confirmed that the actual benefits of the bypass have yet to be determined but it is clear from onsite observations that some of the earlier issues have been alleviated.

8.1.6 With regards to the wider highway network, the shortfall of 1356 dwellings between the OAHN and the Local Plan equates to AM and PM traffic flows of circa 800 two-way movements (based on industry standard calculations using the TRICS database). This is a relatively minor amount of traffic that would disperse across the wider network in multiple directions from a variety of sources, thus further minimising any impacts.

8.1.7 The impacts of the committed/plan developments and the proposed development has also been assessed on the local highway network. This confirms that there is sufficient capacity on the local highway network and that the residual cumulative impact on the highway network will not be severe, subject to LCC’s identified mitigation at the junction of A6 Preston Lancaster New Road/Cockerham Road/Green Lane West/Croston Road/Croston Barn Lane being delivered.
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