

Project Name:	Sarum Academy, Salisbury
Document Reference:	237.0004/RTN/2
Document Name:	Active Travel England Response Technical Note
Prepared By:	Fraser Spinney (April 2026)
Checked By:	Mark Smith (April 2026)
Approved By:	Mark Smith (April 2026)

Revision Record				
Rev	Date	By	Summary of Changes	Aprvd
2	13.05.26	FWS	Updates to Include Highway Officer Comments	MDS

Disclaimer

This document has been prepared in accordance with the scope of Paul Basham Associates Ltd's appointment with its client and is subject to the terms of that appointment. It is addressed to and for the sole use and reliance of Paul Basham Associates clients. Paul Basham Associates accepts no liability for any use of this document other than by its client and only for the purposes, stated in the document, for which it was prepared and provided. No person other than the client may copy (in whole or in part), use or rely on the contents of this document, without the prior written permission of a Director of Paul Basham Associates. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole. The contents of this document are not to be construed as providing legal, business or tax advice or opinion.

© Paul Basham Associates Limited

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Response Technical Note (RTN) has been prepared by Paul Basham Associates on behalf of Wiltshire Council to address comments made by Active Travel England (ATE), dated 10th April 2026 on a live hybrid planning application at Sarum Academy, Salisbury under planning reference PL/2026/00589.
- 1.2 The hybrid planning application comprises of a full planning permission for the works required to expand the existing Sarum Academy school to an 8FE school and an outline planning application for access, scale and layout (with all other matters reserved) to further expand the school from 8FE to 10FE.
- 1.3 Active Travel England were consulted on this application by the Local Planning Authority and have provided two responses, the first dated 3rd March 2026 and the second 10th April 2026. The responses include the same comments, with the re-consultation a result of a minor change in the red line boundary of the site.
- 1.4 The highways department at Wiltshire Council (WC) has provided their view on the comments raised by ATE in an email dated 5th May 2026, where they confirmed that they 'do not agree with' the vast majority of the comments made by ATE.

- 1.5 The remainder of this report addresses the comments raised by ATE.

2. ACTIVE TRAVEL ENGLAND COMMENTS

- 2.1 For ease of reference, ATE's comments will be addressed individually with these categorised into the area they concern.

Travel Plan

- 2.2 ATE have raised concerns regarding the Framework Travel Plan submitted in support of the application. These concerns relate primarily to the length of time that has passed since the data that was taken from the 2011 Travel Plan for the school and the car reliance of staff.

- 2.3 Similar concerns were raised by the highway authority, who have recommended that agreement of the Travel Plan should be obligated as a pre-occupation condition should planning permission be granted. The comments on the Travel Plan will be addressed at this stage, however, in response to the comments received, this is anticipated to include:

- Current staff and pupil survey data
- Greater measures to support modal shift
- Potential financial incentives to support staff modal shift
- Details of staff cycle infrastructure to be provided on site
- Potential financial incentives to support staff modal shift

Walking

- 2.4 ATE raise concerns regarding the gradient of the area on the school's southern approach, particularly in regard to SEND pupils. However, it should be noted that this is an existing school to which pupils are already walking to without issue and that the proportion of SEND pupils is not set to increase as a result of the proposed expansion. WC Highways have also commented on this, stating '*there is no realistic option to address the level difference*' and that the chicanes which ATE commented cause 'clutter' actually '*highlight the steps, which is a highway benefit*'.
- 2.5 Furthermore, the expansion is primarily to accommodate residents of the 1,250-unit residential development immediately north of the school site, with ATE's comments

acknowledging that this development will have a 'positive influence on the neighbourhood permeability towards the north' with a 'simpler, more intuitive route'.

2.6 WC Highways disagree with the concerns raised by ATE in regard to walking and the vast majority of the potential improvements highlighted, setting out their reasons for each point as follows:

- Crossing on bus stop bay – *'The crossing is on the desire line to the school. There is no location to provide this. Moving the crossing further south would be away from the desire line and would be across the parking layby, which is worse than the bus layby. Further north there are staggered barriers and another bus layby. There are already crossing points both to the north and south just beyond various laybys. The crossing point does not pose a highway safety risk.'*
- Missing bus stop shelter and seat – *'There is no bus service that stops here that serves the school.'*
- Missed desire line – *'There is already a crossing point there'*
- Narrow footway and poor surface sealing – *'This area of footway is not public highway but is owned by WC. Addressing maintenance issues cannot be placed on new development. The footway is split into two separate footways and so the narrow(ish) width is not an issue in my view, especially in the context of the application'.*

Cycling

2.7 In their response, ATE raised concerns over the route to the school for cyclists from Salisbury rail station via the town centre and National Cycle Network route 24 and proposed potential improvements to the route. However, the WC Highway Officer disagreed with this, saying:

'It is highly unlikely many children will be cycling from Salisbury Rail Station and city centre. Skey Bridge Road is over 1.5km from the site and it is unlikely many cyclists will use this route to access the school. These suggested improvements cannot be justified in the context of NPPF.'

Liaison with Highway Authority regarding Off-Site Improvements

2.8 It is noted that ATE recommend within their response that the applicant liaises with the LHA on the proposals. Liaison with the LHA has taken place and the LHA have confirmed via

their highways response to the application that they are supportive of the proposals subject to conditions.

- 2.9 Furthermore, in the Highway Officers email response to ATE's comments, they have confirmed that the only improvement they would support would be the provision of tactile paving at the zebra crossing on the internal site access road. They added that this is not public highway and would therefore need to be agreed with WC's property services team and not highways.

On-Site Cycle Parking

- 2.10 ATE sought confirmation of the location of the cycle parking proposed as part of the application, stating that their preference would be for this to be located close to the site access.
- 2.11 As shown in Drawing 75CC13-FTP-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A 08-0004 Rev P03 submitted as part of the planning application, the cycle parking is proposed immediately north of the school entrance, adjacent to the existing church on site.

3. SUMMARY

- 3.1 This RTN has been prepared by Paul Basham Associates on behalf of Wiltshire Council to address comments made by Active Travel England (ATE), dated 10th April 2026, on a live hybrid planning application at Sarum Academy, Salisbury under planning reference PL/2026/00589.
- 3.2 For the reasons set out in this report, it is considered that ATE's comments have been suitably addressed.