

Supplementary Technical Note

Seagry House, Upper Seagry, Wiltshire.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Technical Note provides a general response to matters raised by interested parties relating to Highways and Transportation in regard to the Proposed Development at Seagry House (LPA Ref. PL/2025/06615).
- 1.2 It has been prepared in the context of the Local Highway Response dated 25th September 2025, which confirms a position of no objection subject to the imposition of ordinary “compliance” type conditions.
- 1.3 Interested parties have however raised issues with the proposed scheme, which are generally responded to in this technical note.

2. SAFE & APPROPRIATE ACCESS

- 2.1 It is contested that safe and appropriate access is not achieved to the proposed development via the proposed access works. One specific comment is made in respect of existing post and rail fencing within the adopted public highway verge, opposite the proposed access.
- 2.2 Manual for Streets¹ (MfS), at para. 7.8.6, advises that the impact of obstacles to visibility splays should be assessed in terms of their impact on the overall envelope of visibility. In particular, it states:

“In general, occasional obstacles to visibility that are not large enough to fully obscure a whole vehicle or a pedestrian, including a child or wheelchair user, will not have a significant impact on road safety.”
- 2.3 In respect of the post and rail fencing within the highway verge, it would only be within a proportion of the visibility envelope. For that proportion, it is an open structure that would not fully obscure visibility of an approaching vehicle, motorcycle or cycle to a pedestrian waiting to cross.
- 2.4 With regards to any vegetation within the highway verge or the culvert, the Local Highway Authority has the necessary powers to maintain those as they see fit for the safe operation of the highway by the public.
- 2.5 Taking in to account the operational characteristic of Startley Road, a 30mph village street with low traffic volumes, inclusive of the proposed development traffic, the risk to vulnerable road users will be very low.
- 2.6 In view of the guidance provided by the DfT in their MfS, the presence of a small section of open post and rail fencing within the existing highway verge will not demonstrably impact upon safe and efficient access for pedestrians from the proposed development.

¹ Department for Transport, *Manual for Streets* (HMSO, 2007)

3. TRAFFIC GENERATION & PARKING

- 3.1 The Local Highway Authority in their consultation response acknowledge that a robust assessment of trip numbers has been applied in the Transport Assessment.

“the assessment does certainly provide a robust assessment.... The assessment concludes that a maximum of 17 trips would be generated by the proposals in the peak period and whilst my perceptions would suggest that the actual number of trips is likely to be significantly less than this, even at this scale, the number of trips cannot be considered to have a severe impact on highway capacity.”

- 3.2 Notwithstanding we understand that the scale and consequent floor area of Block B is substantially reduced thereby further supporting the robustness of the assessment submitted. The restrictions of standard methodology, in this instance the TRICS database, results in a likely overestimate of traffic volumes and we concur with the summary of the Local Highway Authority, that the assessment is robust (worst case) and that likely traffic numbers will be less.

- 3.3 In respect of parking numbers, this has been led by the pre-application advice provided by the Local Highway Authority and a requirement to comply with adopted policy and the provision of 1 parking space per 50sq.m. GFA within Block B of the proposed development. Policy requirements themselves are informed by substantial evidence gathering by the Council and have been subject to suitable due diligence and due process before adoption. The required parking standard is retained in respect of the revised scale and floor areas proposed.

- 3.4 In summary, it is incorrect to make a correlation between trip generation and parking in this instance.

4. TRAFFIC IMPACTS

- 4.1 Interested parties raise concerns with regards to the traffic impact of the proposed development on the safe and efficient operation of the local road network.

- 4.2 This issue, along with the views of interested parties, has been considered by the Local Highway Authority, who comment:

“I note that there are a number of objections to these proposals, many citing concerns with traffic. However, the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 states clearly that proposals can only be refused on highway grounds as a result of an unacceptable impact to highway safety or a severe impact to highway capacity. The surrounding highway network is generally sufficiently wide to enable vehicles to pass and the total net number of trips likely to be generated by the site, especially when the extant B8 use is considered, cannot be considered to create an unacceptable highway safety issue on the local highway network, nor create a severe highway capacity issue.”

- 4.3 To some degree there may be an incorrect assumption by interested parties of what vehicle types will access the proposed development and how they may be distributed over the network of roads that lead to and from the site e.g. not all or the majority of traffic would likely be along Henn Lane and indeed existing traffic attracted to and using the existing Henn Lane access is planned to be beneficially reduced and appropriately restricted to “emergency” only. The size of the proposed units (to be reduced) will dictate the nature of the businesses

that operate from them and in this instance they will be typically SME type businesses, and not larger warehouse and distribution type operations.

- 4.4 The size of units would not necessitate extensive bulk goods deliveries or dispatching to customers, but more typically goods handled by parcel delivery companies via their existing multi-drop service. Those multi-drop services are already established and on the network, and whilst those trips will be new to the proposed development site, they will not be new to the road network.
- 4.5 The vast majority of goods will be carried by Light Goods Vehicles, such as those used by parcel delivery companies. A small proportion of goods will be carried by Heavy Goods Vehicles, which are classified as OGV1 (which include vans with twin rear axles and rigid lorries up to 3-axles) and OGV2 (4-axle rigid lorries and all articulated lorries).
- 4.6 Typically, OGV1 & OGV2 vehicles accounts for c5% of overall vehicular trips from “industrial” units and therefore even in a worst case only a very small number of actual trips daily from the proposed development. In a worst case this is less than 1 OGV vehicle in each peak time period. $17 \times 5\% = 0.85$.
- 4.7 Given the small (reduced) size of the proposed units, other than refuse collections the regular occurrence of OGV2 vehicles is not likely. As the site layout has been designed to accommodate the turning of a 10m, length refuse vehicle, both OGV1 and OGV2 rigid vehicles up to this length can be accommodated.
- 4.8 In this context and as accepted by the Local Highway Authority the small amount of additional traffic likely to be generated by the development cannot be regarded as having an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe impact on the road network.

