

Highway Development Control Consultation Response

Planning Application Ref : PL/2025/03672

Description /Location : Land East of Biddestone Lane, Yatton Keynell /Residential Development

Date of response : 16/05/25

Dear James

I note that this application is a full application so there is a requirement to comment on all aspects of the proposal.

Location/Sustainability/Policy

Though the site is located within walking distance of the shop and school in Yatton Keynell . The village has limited facilities in terms of employment opportunities, further education, weekly shopping etc . Yatton Keynell is considered a larger village and though this does allow for some development the proposal is outside of the framework boundary and as such contrary to policy.

The applicant has provided extensive analysis of both walking and cycling distances to adjacent towns with wider access to facilities. However , the roads proposed are not suitable for the average cyclists and certainly not suitable for the more vulnerable users. They are subject to higher speed limits and along much of the routes no or little street lighting. This means this means that these routes cannot be considered as valid and adequate. The roads are also unsuitable for walking due to the lack of pedestrian facilities.

The bus services are not conducive to regular daily use e.g. school attendance, employment.

In summary the location is one which is contrary to both Local and National Policies which encourage development to be located in sites which are able to provide safe and easy non - vehicular access and reduce the reliance on the use of the private vehicle. A refusal should be recommended on this basis.

Accessibility

This is slightly different to the wider requirement of sustainability , this refers more to how the site can be accessed from the more direct vicinity, for example into the village.

The site does benefit from direct pedestrian connections to the village. There are PROW Footpaths in the vicinity but the proposed route thorough the site does not follow the current PROW route and instead connects to a private path which is not highway. The lack of PROW and unadopted status of the path means that the on going connection can not be considered as adequate due to the fact that the land owner could remove permission across the route at any time. At the end of this document is an extract of the PROW routes for information.

The applicant is also suggesting a new footway from the site access to meet with the existing footway to the North . This does provide a route to the village via the PROW which goes to the north/east. In its current state this is not considered as an viable , all year round route.

My colleague in Transportation has made the following comments which I support:

Although this site is right next to the village and its facilities, access on foot is very poor from a utility point of view. Footpath YKEY15 runs through the site then along the narrow verge (which is not surfaced but it appears to be mowed) to link with YKEY16. The importance of YKEY16 as a utility link has already been acknowledged as it has been surfaced.

To argue the site offers sustainable transport options in line with Core Policy 61, the developer must demonstrate they are providing a high quality link to the village hall and to YKEY16. It must be surfaced and of a reasonable width. Rather than trying to improve the narrow verge, it may well be better to put a link through the adjacent land. I would assume the land around the village hall is in the ownership of the parish council (or a trust) so this could be achievable.

Could we please put this requirement back to the developer and ask them to demonstrate they have discussed this possible link with the parish council. If it is not feasible I'd suggest converting YKEY15 to a formal pavement.

I would like to re-iterate that if there is inadequate highway verge to achieve this I would be reticent about allowing a reduction in carriageway width as it would result in a significant change to the highway which would not be considered acceptable.

The applicant should also be looking to achieve off street cycle access , Biddestone Lane is not conducive for the use of the less experienced users (such as school children).

Vehicular access

Biddestone Lane is unlit and for the majority of its length without a footway . It is a single carriageway width and though at some points (closer to the site) the road width does hover around 5.5m, there are pinch points where the width goes below the desirable 5.5m minimum. This can be seen by the presence of informal passing bays. In its current state I do not consider Biddestone Lane suitable for the increase of vehicle movements associated with the development. However, I am happy to accept the use of the junction onto the A420. The applicant could consider some localised widening to address the narrow locations , using the passing bays as a starting point. I am of the opinion that the majority of vehicle movements are likely to be to the south. Biddestone Lane is more consistent in its width when progressing to the north, towards the village, Though again there are lengths over which the carriageway drops below 5.5m. As with the southern route there does appear to be adequate highway to allow for some localised widening , though this would require the removal of established hedgerow which may not be acceptable in planning terms. I am satisfied that the junctions within the village will be able to accommodate the potential extra vehicle movements.

In summary the current geometry and width of Biddestone Lane is not suitable to accommodate the likely vehicle movements associated with the size and scale of the development and as such I am recommended a refusal on this basis.

SITE LAYOUT

Given the size of the development there would be an intention from the LHA to have the roads adopted.

I am happy with the visibility splays demonstrated at the access junction, they should be kept clear of obstruction at and above 900mm .

The applicant appears to have provided adequate parking to meet standards. To be fully accessible all spaces adjacent to a boundary should be widened to 3m . All units should be provided with an EV parking space and this should be indicated on the layout drawing.

Cycle parking will need to be demonstrated.

The road side path on at least one side should be widened to 3,5m to accommodate cyclists , with the associated dropped kerbs to enable cyclists to mount and dismount on to the carriageway.

Refuse and emergency vehicle tracking should be provided.

Internal junction visibility splays should be shown. Visibility splays for the private accesses off the main site road should be provided to ensure that the trees do not impact on what is provided. If the road is to be a 20mph zone then traffic calming should be provided. We do not accept vertical traffic calming so the applicant should be looking to provide horizontal calming measures.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information provided a refusal reason based on the location and the accessibility of the site should be stated . The site currently sits contrary to both CP 60 and CP61.

The applicant is welcome to address the above issues and I would be happy to considered any revised information.

With thanks

Hannah

EXTRACT OF PROW ROUTE

