

Highway Development Control Consultation Response

Planning Application Ref : PL/2025/09541

Description /Location : Devizes Community Hospital , New Park Street

Date of response: 08/01/2026

Dear Helena

This application is for the Reserved matters details in relation to the previously approved Outline application in relation to the residential use of the old Community Hospital , Devizes.

At outline the Council has secured contributions to wider off site pedestrian improvements and has secured a S106 agreement. I am therefore not going to re-iterate those matters previously covered under that process.

Access Details

The location of the accesses have been approved and the use of the adjacent road network also. However, it is apparent that the proposed gates on the New Park Road access are not viable as when open they impact on the ability to access 2 visitor spaces as well as access to the Commercial unit . The gates should be removed .

The applicant should also be tweaking the design of the access on New Park Road . It appears that historically a crossover has been created , this interrupts the continuous footway . The footway should be re-introduced as continuous with a formal crossover provided. Splays of 2.4m (centre of the access) to a point nearside carriageway edge at 22m in both directions should be provided with nothing in the splay which is higher than 60mm above the footway.

EV Parking

My colleague in the E.V. Team has provided some comments. In essence they would prefer to see a charging point per space but acknowledge that this is not the requirement under building regs. They provide the following observations:

- The developer identifies that for homes relying upon non-dedicated parking spaces provision of charging will be through communal charging. More clarity is needed on how this will be provided, as this is an area that is often rejected by the developer as too costly, using the cost ceiling clause in Building Reg Part S. Such an outcome

would leave the residents of the lowest cost housing (affordable social housing) having to access much more expensive public charging solutions.

- Attempting to providing EV charging for all car parking is commendable and has potential to fulfil new build housing obligations from Building Regulations Part-S. However, several three bay parking clusters seem to leave at least one bay without charging provision, assuming each charger location identified is a dual socket charging device that can serve two bays.

In terms of location and layout I am happy to accept the locations as shown

Cycle Parking and Bin Storage.

I have commented upon these together as there is a large extent of provision for these requirements shown as in the same shared space. My Transportation Colleague has commented in more detail in regards to the standards to be met and I have attached her comments so the applicant can read them in full. However, my comment focuses on the bin provision which the applicant must ensure meets the demands of the bin collection regime. I am unsure that the spaces shown provide adequate space to accommodate the bin demand and cycle space. It is important for my colleagues in waste to comment on their opinion on the provision, I have concerns it may lead to bins being left in the carriageway on in locations for pedestrian access .

I particularly want to draw the applicant's attention to the comments of the TP in relation to the number of cycles required and the lack of cycle parking for the Commercial unit. I will be looking to make sure that these comments are addressed.

Vehicular Parking

To be fully happy with the provision I invite the applicant to provide a drawing with the bays marked with the associated flats/residential units. On previous developments in and around the centre of Devizes a reduced standard has been accepted which allows for a reduction to 1 space for a 2 bed and 1-0 spaces for a one bed, with 3 beds having the full quota of 2 parking spaces. This needs to be demonstrated on an approved drawing .

In terms of design each space appears to be the standard 4.8m x 2.4m but all spaces fronting the shared use road should have a minimum of a 0.5m buffer to ensure overhang is not an issue. IN block E for the western corner plot the

hall door appears to be shown to open inwards , this will restrict the useable width of the garage and the door should be made to hang the other way.

Blocks G and F appear to have been approved under a NMA application but it is important that they still meet the requirements in terms of parking for cars and cycles so each space should be allocated as required.

Any parking bays which have planting adjacent to them should be provided with a 2.4m x 2.4m ped splay , which should also be annotated on a drawing for approval. Splays for the parking area provided to Block F should be demonstrated as above, with any trees set back.

I would also like a tracking diagram for the visitor spaces and the additional spaces on the corners of the Block F parkign area to ensure that can be accessed by a car.

There is a parking area behind gates for the eastern corner of Block E, I require a tracking diagram to demonstrate that this is a useable space and a vehicle can indeed access and park.

Who are the spaces noted as 28 and 29 for? These should ideally be removed as they will be difficult to access due to on street paring and encourage manoeuvring adjacent to the exiting footpath.

Given the town centre location I am happy to not insist upon allocated parking for the commercial unit , though it must be provided with cycle and scooter parking.

Non-Vehicular connectivity and site layout.

You will note that my TP colleague has also provided a detailed response in relation to the layout in terms of non-vehicle connectivity. Please take time to read her comments under INTERNAL Layout and act upon them as part of a revised design.

MY comments mirror hers. There appears to be a recognition that the site will benefit from a through route for pedestrians . However, the current route is shown as segregated and this is not appropriate please note the following comments:

The “yellow” route appears to be segregated, I suggest that this would be better as a 3.5m Shared Use Path with no markings, especially given that the pedestrian side appears to measure only 1m in width. Clear detail needs to be provided showing the detail at each end of this route, edging kerbs / flush treatment is recommended.

Where any internal paths align adjacent to planting this planting must be kept below 600mm and I invite the applicant to add a note to the drawing to show this requirement .

There is also recognition that a direct route to both the canal and Commercial Road should be achieved. However, I am of the opinion that both routes require improvement on what has been shown.

Canal connection

Due to the restriction of the levels at the embankment I am minded that the access may not be suitable for cyclists , however, the route will need to form an adopted route to ensure that wider pedestrian access can be secured and should also be able to accommodate wheelers as well as those on foot. I invite the applicant to provide a specific design drawing of how the path will connect to the tow path , this should include a cross section. I am content that alternative routes for cyclists provide an easy and as quick alternative to the canal for those on a bike .

Connections onto Commercial Road

There appears to be shown only one connection and this is between parked cars an adjacent to a boundary wall , both of which hinder intervisibility. I invite the applicant to re-design this frontage to allow for at least one other direct connecting route to this side of the development . It is imperative that direct and easy routes are achieved form both sides of the development directly to Commercial Road to allow access to the town centre on foot .

Wider non-vehicular connectivity has been secured to some extent with a contribution but it is noted that :

It would be beneficial if a dropped kerb was provided on the bend of Commercial Road and Couch Lane where there is likely to be an increase in pedestrian activity, to assist the crossing movement to the dropped kerb opposite on Couch Lane.

Site Layout and Adoptability?

The applicant has provided a tracking diagram for a refuse vehicle but have omitted showing it tracking around the fountain. Though in theory 4m should be adequate I would like to see this tracked .

The applicant has not confirmed if they wish the internal road network to be offer for adoption. If this is the case then they will need to be able to demonstrate adequate drainage and street lighting and an indication of what materials they propose for the adoptable areas.

Other comments

Please note that my TP colleague has also provided comments in relation to the Condition discharges relating to previous TP conditions. I will re-iterate these comments on the DOC application but it is useful to have them at this stage so they can be integrated into the RES matters submission.

IN SUMMARY

The principle of the residential use has been secured at Outline application. The location of the accesses and accessibility for non-vehicular traffic has also been agreed upon. However, I invite the applicant to provide the additional information to fully inform an approval at RES matter stage:

1. Access details showing a continuous footway along the site access on New Park Road.
2. Visibility at accesses shown and kept clear of obstruction at 600mm
3. Visibility splays shown at parkign areas when adjacent to planting at a 2.4m x2.4m (taken at the edge of each space).
4. Removal of the gates on the Access at New Park Road.
5. Tracking for cars into the visitor spaces and resident spaces adj to the entrance of Block F parking area.
6. Tracking of refuse vehicle around the fountain.
7. Tracking of cars entering and parking in the private parkign area adjacent to eastern end of Block E.
8. 0.5m buffer applied to all parking spaces directly adjacent to the shared use road.
9. Reversal of hall door into garage for the western corner of Block E
- 10.Re-design of footpath link to Commercial Road.

- 11.Introduction of at least one other footpath link to Commercial Road.
12. Removal of segregation marking on internal cycle link.
- 13.Removal of parking spaces 28 and 29
- 14.Confirm amount of bin storage required and ensure that allocated space can accommodate requirements.
15. ADDRESS COMMENTS RAISED IN THE TRANSPORT PLANNING REPOSNSE

With regards
Hannah Jones
HDC