

**From:** Marcus Plank

**Sent:** 27 November 2024 09:52

**To:** Mead, Christopher ; Madge, Adam <[Adam.Madge@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:Adam.Madge@wiltshire.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Seamus Quinn; Tim Gent; Nick Heard; Jeremy Moore; Suzanne Nixon

**Subject:** PL/24/05527 Response - Spring Park

Dear Chris,

Many thanks for your comments in relation to the extension to Spring Park data centre campus application (planning ref: PL/24/05527) dated 12<sup>th</sup> November 2024. Having considered these comments, we have provided a response to your comments, as detailed below, and revised plan IMA-22-188-009\_B attached to this email.

*WC Comment - "In this regard having duly considered the proposal I cannot support the introduction of the 1.2m painted pedestrian margin and I also cannot support the existing condition of the carriageway."*

**IMA Response** - The condition of the Rowan Lane carriageway is noted, as is the request to remove the 1.2m painted pedestrian white line from the pedestrian improvements plan. Revised drawing IMA-22-188-009\_B indicates that Rowan Lane is to be resurfaced between the junction with Westwells Road and the existing painted white line west of the proposed access junction, and also shows no painted white lining is to be provided along this section of Rowan Lane.

*WC Comment - "The carriageway should be resurfaced and the route should remain as an open width for all users. The presence of signing to indicate pedestrians in carriageway would beneficially aid the awareness of motorists to the presence of those most vulnerable and rightfully within the carriageway."*

**IMA Response** - Revised drawing IMA-22-188-009\_B indicates that signage (in accordance with TSRGD) will be provided at key points along Rowan Lane to highlight the potential presence of pedestrians in the carriageway.

*WC Comment - "The applicant should address the following: Revised access strategy...Subject to this change being presented then the highway authority would raise no objection subject to conditions for:*

*Travel Plan*

*Delivery and Servicing Management Plan*

*Construction Method Statement Parking Management Strategy"*

**IMA Response** - In light of the above response and revised drawing IMA-22-188-009\_B, it is considered this address the objection on highway safety for the potential conflict with pedestrians and hence this objection should now be removed. The above referenced four documents can all reasonably be controlled via the use of a planning condition requiring their submission and approval in writing.

I trust that the above is sufficient to remove the current objection.

Kind regards,

Marcus Plank BA (Hons) MCIHT

Transport Planner

**IMA Transport Planning Ltd**

Montreux House, 18A James Street West, Bath, BA1 2BT