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Date 25 April 2018

Subject Matter 1 – Legal Compliance, Procedural Requirements and the Duty to Cooperate

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 1 Examination in Public [EiP] hearing sessions.

1.3 Separate representations have been submitted in respect of the following Matters:
   1. Matter 2 – Strategy and Strategic Policies
   2. Matter 3 – Housing and Employment Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) and Requirements
   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 [Representor 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 made throughout the Local Plan preparation process 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 2 – Compliance with the DtC, particularly in relation to consideration of housing needs

2.1 Is there evidence that the Council has cooperated effectively with adjoining authorities in seeking to meet any unmet housing needs from the District?

The Framework\(^1\) sets out that local authorities have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic priorities. Strategic priorities include the delivery of homes and jobs needed in an area\(^2\). The Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities.

2.2 Wyre Borough Council [WBC] has produced a Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance which forms part of the Council’s evidence base. The statement seeks to demonstrate that WBC has prepared the WCLP in constructive cooperation with neighbouring authorities and other key organisations. The statement sets out that the key strategic cross-boundary matters between Wyre and the adjoining authorities are:

1. Wyre’s OAN figure;
2. Wyre’s shortfall in its capacity to accommodate its housing OAN; and
3. The capacity of adjoining local authorities to assist Wyre in meeting the unmet housing need in their respective areas.

Wyre’s OAN Figure

The WCLP indicates that the Council cannot meet in full the housing OAN primarily because of highway constraints. TW does not dispute the Council’s OAN calculations and considers the OAN to be sound. Based on the evidence presented by the Council in the Housing Background Paper and SHMAs, it has identified an OAN need to provide 9,580 new homes between 2011 and 2031. The WCLP target of 8,224 new homes over the plan period, represents a shortfall of 1,360 units within the Plan period.

2.4 However, TW strongly refutes the Council’s suggestion that their full OAN cannot be met due to highway constraints and has prepared evidence to counter the Council’s claim.

Wyre’s shortfall in its capacity to accommodate its housing OAN

The key consideration in this instance is whether the highway constraint identified in the Council’s evidence, but disputed in evidence which accompanied our representations to the Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan and in the attached Traffic and Transport Note, should be viewed in with §14 of the Framework. In order for a local plan to demonstrate soundness in accordance with §182, it must seek to “meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirement”. TW considers that the Council has not assessed what level of infrastructure upgrades are required to meet its full OAN.

2.6 Every avenue should be explored in terms of modes of transport, distribution of units to the most sustainable settlements, mitigation and provision of additional highway infrastructure and

---

\(^1\) Framework §178

\(^2\) Framework §156
large-scale development projects over a longer plan period could alleviate the Council’s perceived highways constraint.

2.7 TW considers that the evidence presented by the WBC is insufficient to justify the divergence away from meeting the Council’s full OAN.

The capacity of adjoining local authorities to assist Wyre in meeting the unmet housing need in their respective areas.

2.8 The Council’s evidence seeks to demonstrate that it has cooperated effectively with the adjoining authorities to overcome all key strategic cross boundary issues. However, TW disagrees with this assertion and considers that the Council has failed in its Duty to Cooperate obligation.

2.9 Although the Council has undertaken some discussions with the neighbouring authorities, these discussions have not been effective in ensuring that Wyre’s full OAN is met within the HMA. It was established early in the process that Blackpool Council could not accommodate any of Wyre’s need. However, Fylde does have capacity to cater for Wyre’s need but claimed that Wyre approached them too late in the plan preparation process and did not engage effectively. This undermines Wyre’s evidence of the difficulty in meeting their full OAN in the HMA.

2.10 WBC’s justification for pursuing a housing requirement below its OAN is based on the perceived highway constraints. §14 of the Framework makes it clear that “Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted”.

2.11 Fylde Council has capacity to cater for Wyre’s unmet need. However, Fylde Council (ID 0289) sets out in their consultation response to the Publication Draft Wyre Local Plan (4th November 2017) that “the plan as published is the first time that the plan or any draft of the strategy has been shared with Fylde Council” and “earlier opportunities to provide input to a draft were not available”.

2.12 Furthermore, in relation to Co-operation and Joint Working, Fylde Council sets out that Statement of Compliance, “do not fully set out an agreed position to accurately reflect the nature of co-operation that occurred, or do not fully set out the background and circumstances applicable at the time to the satisfaction of Fylde Council” and “gives an incomplete and misleading impression of events”.

2.13 It is also worth bearing in mind that WBC submitted a formal objection to the legal compliance and soundness of the Fylde Local Plan [FLP] on the matter of Duty to Cooperate. WBC set out in their representation to the Fylde Stage 1 Hearing Sessions that “Fylde has not maximised the effectiveness of plan making engaging constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with Wyre in relation to the shortfall in housing provision”. The representation continue to state that “it would appear that in developing their Local Plan, Fylde ignored the issue of a shortfall in Wyre”. Similarly, at the Stage 2 Hearings, Wyre Council set out that “Fylde continues not to effectively co-operate on the issue of unmet housing need in Wyre but treat Wyre as another consultee”.

2.14 It is clear from the various letters and submissions that Fylde and Wyre have not cooperated effectively to ensure that Wyre’s full OAN is being met. The issue has been a long-standing matter and has not been dealt with in a positive manner. As such, it cannot be concluded that the plan has been positively prepared.
Furthermore, the main modification to the FLP [§1.27] sets out that Fylde recognises Wyre’s difficulties in meeting its objectively assessed need for housing. The supporting text continues to state that Fylde Council will undertake an early review of their plan to examine the issue. However, TW disagrees with the effectiveness of this approach, particularly the lack of certainty over timing and the lack of a prescribed mechanism for undertaking the early review to ensure the delivery of Wyre’s unmet need.

The recently released draft changes to the NPPF advocate the use of a Statement of Common Ground to demonstrate effective working\(^3\). Although the draft NPPF can be afforded limited weight at this stage, it indicates a direction of travel from a national planning policy perspective. It outlines that strategic matters should be dealt with rather than deferred. This is not the case in this instance and as such, it can be concluded that the WCLP is not effective.

Assuming the proposed Fylde Main Modifications are incorporated within their Local Plan as currently worded and the plan is found sound, there is no policy requirement, timescales or certainty that a review will be undertaken when the WCLP is adopted. Fylde Council must only “examine this issue” and there is no certainty that Fylde Council will pursue a partial or full review of their Local Plan to cater for Wyre’s unmet needs.

Bearing in mind the time and considerable effort it has taken for Fylde Council to get to this stage in the preparation of their Local Plan, the Council and its Councillors may have little appetite to commence the review of the Local Plan to cater for Wyre’s needs immediately after adopting their plan. Even if Fylde Council commenced a review of their Local Plan, there will be a lengthy delay associated with undertaking the required process which will not aid the delivery of the housing necessary to meet WBC’s unmet need.

Conclusion

In conclusion, TW is strongly of the opinion that the Council has not cooperated effectively with adjoining authorities. To have cooperated effectively, Wyre would have had to achieve its desired result of delivering its unmet need in the wider HMA. This objective has not been met.

Recent decisions of Local Plan Inspector’s\(^4\) have found that cooperation must be meaningful and have a clear outcome. This cannot be said to be the case in this instance, as Council does not have an effective strategy in place to address the cross-boundary issue of unmet housing needs in the HMA. It has therefore failed to meet the obligations imposed by the Duty to Cooperate.

**2.2 Is the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) an effective tool to facilitate ongoing engagement with adjoining authorities?**

A Memorandum of Understanding [MoU] has been in place between Blackpool Council, Fylde Council, Wyre Council and Lancashire County Council since August 2013 and the latest version was updated and agreed upon in April 2015. The aim of the MoU is to provide for strategic planning issues which require cross boundary co-operation and collaboration to ensure the requirements of the Government’s ‘Duty to Cooperate’ are met and that the local plans of the Fylde Coast Authorities are sustainable, deliverable and found ‘sound’ at Examination. It seeks to formalise the ongoing dialogue and cooperation that currently exists between the four authorities.

\(^{3}\) §36

Despite the MoU being formulated and agreed upon as far back as 2013, it has clearly not been an effective tool to facilitate ongoing engagement and agreement between the three authorities. Wyre Council formally objected to the soundness of the Fylde Local Plan on the matter of Duty to Cooperate and similarly Fylde Council has formally objected to the WCLP and set out that “the plan as published is the first time that the plan or any draft of the strategy has been shared with Fylde Council”. Furthermore, Fylde Council outlined in response to the Duty to Cooperate Statement of Compliance that it did “not fully set out the background and circumstances applicable at the time to the satisfaction of Fylde Council”.

There is no evidence presented by WBC to demonstrate effective engagement and co-operation.

The MoU sets out as one of its objectives that the relevant parties “will work together to reach a consensus on housing provision across the Fylde Coast sub-region”. It is clear from the various letters and submissions by Fylde and Wyre to each other’s emerging Local Plans, that both authorities have not cooperated effectively to ensure that Wyre’s full OAN is being met within the HMA and the MoU has proved an effective tool. It is unlikely that the MoU will become a more effective tool in the future given that it has been in place for 5 years and an agreement on the delivery of Wyre’s full OAN could not be reached. Despite the importance of cross border issue in these circumstances, the MoU has not been updated for 3 years and appears to be given little weight and importance by WBC and Fylde Council.

In conclusion, TW considers that the principle of having a MoU is useful and appropriate but the current version of the MoU is not an effective tool to facilitate ongoing engagement and cooperation. It has failed in one of its primary objectives of reaching a consensus on housing provision across the Fylde Coast sub-region. A new version of the MoU is required which contains specific actions and requirements to ensure the Council meet their Duty to Cooperate in accordance with national policy and delivers Wyre’s unmet need.

The Council has therefore failed to meet the requirements of the Framework [§47, §159 & §§178-181].

### 2.3 Is there evidence that Wyre have cooperated effectively with Lancashire County Council (LCC) on relevant issues such as transport and education infrastructure?

Wyre Council has identified that highway capacity is the main constraint to development and, in particular, housing development in Wyre. LCC are responsible for the Local Highway Network and the production of the Local Transport Plan and its implementation Plan.

Early in 2015 Wyre set up a Highways Working Group with LCC and Highways England to prepare transport evidence to support the preparation of the Local Plan. LCC produced a document titled Implications for Housing Developments within the Proposed Wyre Local Plan (February 2017) and it is based upon the findings of this documents that the Council has capped the delivery of housing units in each settlement. However, this study is a Desktop Assessment and is only a high level ‘broad brush approach’. It is clear that it is not a detailed transport assessment and although the preparation of a detailed transport assessment, taking account of all the commitments and draft allocations in the emerging Local Plan, would be a difficult task, this is what is required to underpin the proposed cap on delivery of housing. Capping the housing requirement in the WCLP needs to be robustly justified and WBC needs to demonstrate that it has ‘left no stone unturned’.
2.29 A detailed highway study to justify the setting of a housing requirement below the OAN for an authority should set out a detailed and robust methodology for assessing highway capacity in the first instance. It should also study a number of delivery options including spatial distribution and scale of development, the mitigation measures which could be delivered by development to alleviate concerns, likely future modal shifts and planning infrastructure improvements and based on this evidence set the maximum quantum of development which can be achieved over a plan period. It also required detailed highway modelling incorporating assumptions on the mix and tenure of proposed allocations. The housing mix and tenure proposed in a detailed SHMA could be used as the starting point for the testing of future development scenarios. This has not happened and as such the Council’s approach is flawed and unjustified.

2.30 The evidence underpinning the proposed housing requirement uses the GraHAM toolkit and the Council’s own evidence describes this as ‘a rudimental model’ for assessing future growth. Furthermore, the Council’s modelling does not consider the potential additional relief provided by the proposed Preston Western Distributor, M55 Junction 2, East West Link Road, Cottam link, A585 Windy Harbour Skippool improvements and M55 Junction 1 slip road and circulatory improvement.

2.31 In accordance with the Framework\(^5\), WBC needs to quantify what level of additional movements would represent a severe impact and work within this parameter. It should also explore every avenue to outline appropriate mitigation measures which could be put in place to overcome the perceived issues. The Framework is clear that “development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”. The Council’s evidence has not sought to sufficiently demonstrate what quantum of development, and spatial distribution would represent a severe impact and as such their approach is flawed and not robust.

2.32 TW considers that Wyre has not cooperated effectively with Lancashire County Council on highway related matters and significantly more robust and detailed analysis is required to underpin the proposed cap on housing delivery. To have cooperated effectively, a positively prepared plan would be required which sought to overcome the perceived highway constraints and implement appropriate mitigation measures.

**Issue 4 – The Local Plan Timeframe**

**4.1 Is the timeframe of the LP appropriate (2011-2031)?**

2.33 The Framework [§157] states that Local Plans should be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date. Furthermore, the draft changes to the NPPF, although garnering limited weight at this stage, clearly see the 15-year time period looking forward as being important and states “strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption, to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure” [§22].

2.34 The WCLP currently covers the period to 2031. However, at best, the plan will be adopted in late 2018 and as such the requisite 15-year time minimum horizon will not be achieved. The time period for the WCLP is therefore not effective or consistent with national policy.

---

\(^5\) §32
TW considers that the time period should be extended to give more flexibility and provide sufficient housing allocations to meet identified needs. Planning over a longer time period and delivering more strategic sites could subsidise additional highway infrastructure which would overcome the Council’s perceived highway issues in line with emerging national planning policy.

### 4.2 Is the start date of 2011 consistent with the evidence base?

TW does not have a concern in relation to the start date of the Local Plan being 2011. However, as set out above, our concern relates to the necessity for the WCLP to plan for an appropriate time period (i.e. 15-year post adoption) and the opportunities this might open up for major improvements and investment in infrastructure to overcome the perceived highway constraint.
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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.
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 to 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 Council’s 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;
- Sainsbury's 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:
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.

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.

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

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 (0700-100) 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 detailed 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>

**Developments currently going through Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committed Development</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</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.

7.7 Trip Distribution

7.7.1 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

7.7.2 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 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:
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.

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**

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

<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>2031 Base with Committed Development</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>2031 Base with Committed Development + Dev</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>

Table 7.5 – Longmoor Lane/A6/Moss Lane Capacity Assessment Results
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.
TPMA1461 Land at Cockerham Road, Garstang
Traffic and Transport Note

<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>A6N Ahead U-Turn Left Left2 Ahead2</td>
<td>77.0 : 77.0%</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 South Ahead Ahead2 Right Right2 U-Turn</td>
<td>86.7 : 86.7%</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croston Road Right Left Ahead Right2 Left2</td>
<td>86.0 : 86.0%</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockerham Road U-Turn Ahead Ahead2 Left Right</td>
<td>28.3 : 28.3%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane West Right Left Right2 Left2 Ahead</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croston Barn Lane Left Right Left2 Right2 Ahead</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2031 Base with Committed Development+Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6N Ahead U-Turn Left Left2 Ahead2</td>
<td>78.8 : 78.8%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 South Ahead Ahead2 Right Right2 U-Turn</td>
<td>90.7 : 90.7%</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croston Road Right Left Ahead Right2 Left2</td>
<td>89.5 : 89.5%</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockerham Road U-Turn Ahead Ahead2 Left Right</td>
<td>50.2 : 50.2%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane West Right Left Right2 Left2 Ahead</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croston Barn Lane Left Right Left2 Right2 Ahead</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.7 — Capacity Assessment Results – A6 Preston New Road/Cockerham Road

7.8.15 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.

7.8.16 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.

7.8.17 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.

7.8.18 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.

7.8.19 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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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinates</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>646 A6 Cockerham Road</td>
<td>529 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 B5272 Croston Barn Lane</td>
<td>110 B6340 Green Lane West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 A6 Preston Lancaster Road</td>
<td>651 B5272 Croston Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 B5272 Cockerham Road</td>
<td>203 A6 Garstang Road (North)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179 651 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
<td>179 A6 Garstang Road (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
<td>466 A6 Garstang Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
<td>84 B5269 Woodplumpton Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 B6340 Green Lane West</td>
<td>74 B5269 Whittingham Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>120 B5269 Whittingham Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
<td>108 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road (South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 B5272 Croston Barn Lane</td>
<td>107 B5272 Croston Barn Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 B6340 Green Lane West</td>
<td>99 B6340 Green Lane West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>91 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
<td>80 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>64 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
<td>503 A6 Preston Lancaster New Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>46 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>45 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>44 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>43 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>42 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>41 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>40 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>39 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>39 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>38 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>37 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>36 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>35 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>34 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>33 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>32 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>31 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>30 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>29 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>28 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>27 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>26 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>25 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>24 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>23 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>22 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>21 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>20 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>19 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>18 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>17 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>16 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>15 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>14 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>13 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>12 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>11 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>10 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>9 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>8 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>7 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>6 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>5 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>4 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>3 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>2 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>1 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 A586 The Avenue</td>
<td>0 A586 The Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AM Committed development (consented + in planning)
Traffic Diagram

- A6 Preston Lancaster Road
- B5272 Cockerham Road
- Green Lane West
- Preston Barn Lane
- Crockton Road
- Preston Lancaster New Road
- Longmoor Lane
- Moss Lane
- Local Road
- A586 The Avenue
- A6 Garstang Road (North)
- B5269 Woodplumpton Lane
- B5269 Whittingham Lane
- A6 Garstang Road
- A6 Garstang Road (South)
- M65 Preston Northern Bypass (West)
- M65 Preston Northern Bypass (East)
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