

rappor



Manor Farm, Sopworth

Badminton Estate

Technical Note 01
July 2026





TECHNICAL NOTE

Project Name: Manor Farm, Sopworth
Client: Badminton Estate
Job No: 260386
TN Status / No: Issue 01
Date: July 2026
Prepared By: Grace Hancock
Checked By: Mike Glaze
Approved By: Mike Glaze
Subject: Response to Local Residents' Transport Review

1. Introduction

Introduction

- 1.1 Rappor has been instructed by Badminton Estate to prepare a Technical Note (TN) in support of a Class R planning application concerning the change of use of three agricultural buildings to flexible commercial and light industrial use, falling within Use Class E, with ancillary storage at Manor Farm, Sopworth, Chippenham, SN14 6NL.
- 1.2 The buildings subject to this application consist of three modern agricultural barns, which are currently vacant, having fallen out of active agricultural use following the cessation of a farm tenancy in 2022. The Estate are now seeking to secure a commercial tenant for the buildings. The barns and associated land have an associated agricultural fall-back position use and therefore could be utilised, with no planning controls, which would introduce significant traffic movements by large vehicles.
- 1.3 Rappor produced a Transport Statement (TS) in May 2026, which was reviewed by Wiltshire Council (WC), acting as the Local Highway Authority (LHA). WC provided a consultee response in July 2026, who confirmed that the principle of the redevelopment of the site is not considered to have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network if the lack of parking and the access improvements are addressed appropriately. The LHA response is provided at **Appendix A**.



- 1.4 This TN has been produced to respond to comments raised within a separate TN produced by Railton TPC Ltd on behalf of local residents, which reviewed the application from a transport perspective. The TN is provided at **Appendix B**. It is understood that Railton TPC Ltd primarily acts on behalf of local parish councils and residents' associations and the contents of the report are not considered truly objective. The Railton TPC Ltd comments contradict those of the LHA and have taken a selective approach to quoting national planning policy.
- 1.5 For ease of reference, the comments from Railton TPC Ltd and Rappor's corresponding technical responses have been grouped into the following categories, which are to be addressed within this TN:-
- a. Trip Generation;
 - b. Sustainability;
 - c. Surrounding Road Network;
 - d. Site Access; and
 - e. Parking.

2. Trip Generation

Car Trip Generation

Comment

- 2.1 The Railton TN is provided at **Appendix B**, however with regard to the proposed car trip generation, it stated the following:

"All of the survey sites are in more urban settings with far greater population density within walking distance than the Sopworth site. Urban settings are provided with much higher levels of provision for pedestrians (footways, crossings), cyclists and public transport than the village of Sopworth and thus provide greater opportunities to travel by means other than the private car (see below).

The unrepresentative nature of the source trip generation surveys leads to the conclusion that the level of car use at the proposed site is likely to have been underestimated."



Rappor Technical Response

- 2.2 In response to the above, the use of TRICS is standard industry practice and accepted by local authorities for forecasting development trip generation. It should be recognised that no individual TRICS site will ever be perfectly representative of a specific development and that judgement is required in selecting the most appropriate sites that are available, in order to provide approximate indication of a site's trip generation.
- 2.3 TRICS creates trip rates by averaging data from all the selected sites and applying those rates on a pro-rata basis to the proposed floor area. The average floor area of the selected survey sites is approximately 150sq.m to 200sq.m greater than the floor areas of proposed uses, which is not considered a significant difference and is well within the range of variation typically expected when undertaking trip generation assessments using the TRICS database. As such, the selected sites are considered sufficiently comparable to provide an indication of likely trip generation for the proposed development, especially in the absence of sites of a more comparable size. The TRICS trip rates were also accepted by the LHA, which demonstrates that they are reasonable.
- 2.4 It should also be noted that even if the proposal was to generate a greater number of vehicle trips than what is set out in the TS, it would not result in the surrounding junctions operating over capacity and therefore does not conflict with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

HGV Trip Generation

Comment

- 2.5 The Railton TN is provided at **Appendix B**, however, with regard to the proposed HGV trip generation, it stated the following:

“Light industrial uses can generate significant numbers of larger vehicles. The TS provides no assessment of the potential for the site to generate larger vehicles.

The presence of larger vehicles has the potential to lead to adverse amenity and safety impacts.”

Rappor Technical Response

- 2.6 In response to the above, the TRICS report contained in the TS accounts for all vehicles, therefore the number of potential HGV trips associated with the proposed industrial use has already been included in that assessment. However, for completeness, a summary of the HGV-only trips based on the submitted TRICS assessment is provided in **Table 2.1**, whilst the full TRICS report is contained at **Appendix C**.



Vehicle Type	Time Period	Trip Rates (per 100sq.m)			Trip Generation		
		Arr.	Dep.	Two-Way	Arr.	Dep.	Two-Way
OGV	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	0.034	0.067	0.101	0	1*	1*
	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	0	0	0	0	0	0
	12-Hour (07:00-19:00)	0.514	0.514	1.028	3	3	6
LGV	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	0.168	0.067	0.235	1	0	1
	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	0.067	0.201	0.268	0	1	1
	12-Hour (07:00-19:00)	1.888	1.778	3.666	10	10	20
Total HGVs	AM Peak (08:00-09:00)	-	-	-	1	1	2
	PM Peak (17:00-18:00)	-	-	-	0	1	1
	12-Hour (07:00-19:00)	-	-	-	13	13	26

Table 2.1: HGV Trip Rates and Forecast Trip Attraction – Light Industrial

(*Note: subject to rounding)

- 2.7 **Table 2.1** indicates that the proposed light industrial facility could be associated with approximately two two-way vehicle trips in the AM peak hour and one HGV trip in the PM peak hour, which is not significant.
- 2.8 It is also important to recognise that the existing lawful agricultural use of the site is capable of generating larger vehicle movements, including tractors, trailers, agricultural machinery, feed deliveries, livestock transport and other servicing vehicles. Therefore, the presence of larger vehicles on the local highway network would be consistent with vehicle movements that could lawfully be associated with the site. Even if these movements do not currently occur, the lawful fallback position remains an important material consideration, which has not been considered by Railton TPC Ltd.

3. Sustainability

Comment

- 3.1 The Railton TN is provided at **Appendix B**, which provides a number of comments in relation to the site's sustainability. The key comments to be addressed are as follows:

"The latter part of Paragraph 110 recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport vary between urban and rural areas. This is true but focuses attention on the key issue which is that this is an inappropriate location for significant numbers of employees. The fact that there are differences between rural and urban areas does not negate the fundamental policy conflict of locating significant numbers of jobs, that would attract employees from over a wide area, where it is impossible to walk or use public transport and cycling is difficult and hazardous. [...]"

It has been shown that sustainable modes are not prioritised. It is also clear that there is no sustainable transport vision for the site, and that the scale and type of development in this location is inappropriate in terms of sustainable transport. The proposed development does not, therefore comply with Paragraph 115 of the NPPF. [...]"



A further policy conflict is evident from the fact that safe and suitable access to the site cannot be achieved for all users. The lack of any safe pedestrian routes from surrounding areas and the narrowness of surrounding lanes would make travel on foot or by bicycle hazardous.

Rappor Technical Response

- 3.2 In response to the above, the site's location and the relatively limited opportunities for travel by walking, cycling and public transport must be considered within the context of a Class R prior approval application, where the principle of employment use within existing agricultural buildings is already established.
- 3.3 The Railton TN concludes that the proposal conflicts with Paragraphs 110, 115 and 117 of the NPPF as future users are likely to rely predominantly on the private car. However, this does not give sufficient weight to Paragraph 110, which recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas and that this should be taken into account in decision-making. In addition, paragraph 110 is related to 'significant development', which states that *"Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport mode"*. This is not a significant development; it is a small-scale barn conversion scheme and therefore the relevance of the section of paragraph 110 has been misconstrued in the Railton TN.
- 3.4 The author of the Railton TN has also 'emphasised' certain sections of the NPPF policies. This is an incorrect way to interpret documents of this nature. Planning policies, in the same way as statutory legislation, must be read as a whole and the un-emphasised part of paragraph 110 of the NPPF reads *"However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making."* This is clearly an important distinction when considering a development of this type in a non-urban setting, which Railton TPC Ltd have seemingly dismissed to suit their argument.
- 3.5 The proposal does not involve the creation of a new large scale employment site but rather the conversion and re-use of existing agricultural buildings. The NPPF seeks to prioritise sustainable transport modes where appropriate having regard to the type, scale and location of development. In relation to the proposed development, the realistic opportunities for sustainable travel are influenced by the site's rural setting and should be assessed accordingly.



- 3.6 The Railton TN also puts unnecessary emphasis on parts of the NPPF without reference to Paragraph 89 (supporting a prosperous rural economy), which recognises that *“sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport.”*
- 3.7 Furthermore, paragraphs 88 and 89 of the NPPF are specifically aimed at supporting business growth in rural areas, which is exactly what the development is seeking to provide. Therefore, quoting and emphasising parts of policies within section 9 of the NPPF relating to sustainable travel with no consideration to the wording of paragraphs 88 and 89 regarding rural business development has resulted in an overly negative perception of the development from Railton TPC Ltd.
- 3.8 The NPPF therefore acknowledges that travel to developments in rural locations will differ compared to those located in urban areas and does not require all employment sites to offer the same range of modal choice to be acceptable.
- 3.9 Paragraph 116 of the NPPF also states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Given that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable or severe impact as a result of the site's location, it does not conflict with Paragraph 116.

4. Low Standard of Surrounding Highways

Comment

- 4.1 The Railton TN is provided at **Appendix B**, which provides a number of comments in relation to the surrounding highway condition. The key comments to be addressed are as follows:

“It is concluded that the use of the surrounding lanes by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians; vulnerable highway users, makes them highly sensitive to changes in traffic levels. The development of an employment site attracting significant numbers of vehicles in this location raises concerns regarding vulnerable highway users in terms of amenity and safety.”

Rappor Technical Response

- 4.2 As set out earlier in this TN as well as the previously submitted TS, the forecast trip generation associated with the development is low and would not attract the significant numbers of vehicles, as is suggested in the Railton TN. Indeed, the TN itself acknowledges that the level of traffic generated would not result in links or junctions operating over capacity.



- 4.3 Historically, the lawful agricultural use of the site has relied on the same surrounding road network for access and is capable of generating a range of large vehicle movements, including tractors, trailers, and agricultural machinery. The Railton TPC Ltd takes no account of the actual net trip impact of the development when compared against the extant use.
- 4.4 As such, vehicle movements associated with the site will not be entirely new the network and the resulting impacts would not create an unacceptable highway safety impact, as set out in Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

5. Access Arrangements

Comment

- 5.1 The Railton TN is provided at **Appendix B**, which provides a number of comments in relation to the access arrangements. The key comments to be addressed are as follows:

“In order to achieve safe visibility to the south, it is proposed to remove an existing tree and to realign the wall to ensure that it does not obstruct visibility. [...]

The TA suggests that visibility could be achieved either by relocating the wall behind the visibility splay as indicated on Drawing 3001 Rev. P01 or by reducing the height of the wall to 0.9m. The latter would not be acceptable since visibility splays should be entirely within highway land. The wider verge created by relocating the wall behind the visibility splay would need to be adopted as highway. [...]

Visibility to the north is shown measured to the centre of the road. This is not standard practice as visibility is generally measured to the nearside kerb to ensure that the whole of the road at a point at the safe visibility distance is visible to a driver seeking to turn out of the access. [...]

The applicant fails to acknowledge that vehicles park within the proposed visibility splay to the north. This is a serious highway safety issue. The deficiency of visibility to the north represent an unacceptable highway safety impact. The application should be refused on this basis in accordance with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF. Further highway safety concerns relate to the conflict between site generated traffic and vulnerable highway users on the surrounding narrow lanes. [...]

It should be noted that the proposed development will lead to a very substantial intensification of use of the access compared to its former agricultural uses. The agricultural buildings are associated with Manor Farm whose land lies to the west of the site.”

Rappor Technical Response

- 5.2 In response to the above, the access drawings submitted as part of the application demonstrate that visibility splays can be achieved through the proposed access improvements, including the removal of vegetation and amendments to the existing boundary wall, where necessary.
- 5.3 It is not necessary for visibility splays to be entirely within highway land, as suggested in the Railton TN, provided the visibility splay is within land under the applicant's control and not reliant on third-party land. As such, the required visibility splays can be achieved through the proposed improvements. The LHA agreed that the access proposals were acceptable. Again, the extant use of the site must be weighed in the balance of any planning and highway assessment.
- 5.4 The Railton TN suggests that visibility should be measured to the nearside edge of the carriageway as opposed to the centreline. However, as mentioned in the TS, Manual for Streets 2 allows for some flexibility to be applied and for visibility to be measured to the wheel track.
- 5.5 Whilst there is no physical segregation, on-street parking has been observed in this location and further evidenced in the Railton TN. Therefore, it is reasonable to measure the splay to the centre line in this location, given that the visibility assessment aims to demonstrate that drivers egressing from an access can see approaching vehicles, rather than to require visibility across the full width of the carriageway in every situation. Measuring the visibility to the centreline accords with Manual for Streets 2 given that vehicles approaching from the village will be on the eastern side of the carriageway and therefore the visibility is measured to the vehicle wheel track.

6. Parking

Comment

- 6.1 The Railton TN is provided at **Appendix B**, which provides a number of comments in relation to parking. The key comments to be addressed are as follows:

“A parking standard of one car parking space per 30sqm of development is cited as the current standard for offices. The proposed development has an area of around 951 sqm (see Section 6 of TS). This would require around 30 car parking spaces [...]

It is concluded that the planning application boundary does not provide sufficient space to accommodate the necessary level of parking and is likely to lead to unsafe parking on the access road or on the external highway.”



Rappor Technical Response

- 6.2 In response to the above, given that this is a Class R planning application, detailed parking arrangements were not included previously in the TS. However, a parking plan has been produced and is contained at **Appendix D**.
- 6.3 It demonstrates that 32 car parking spaces can be provided on site, in accordance with the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 Car Parking Strategy.
- 6.4 Therefore, there is sufficient parking to accommodate the proposed development and would not result in unsafe parking on the access road or on the external highway.

7. Summary & Conclusions

- 7.1 Rappor has been instructed by Badminton Estate to prepare a TN in support of a Class R planning application concerning the change of use of three agricultural buildings to flexible commercial and light industrial use, falling within Use Class E, with ancillary storage at Manor Farm, Sopworth, Chippenham, SN14 6NL
- 7.2 This TN has responded to the key points raised by Railton TPC Ltd on behalf of local residents, which demonstrates that in highway terms the development is acceptable.

Appendices

Appendix A	LHA Consultation Response
Appendix B	Railton TN
Appendix C	TRICS Report
Appendix D	Parking Plan

Appendix A – LHA Consultation Response

Highway Development Control Consultation Response

Planning Application Ref: PL/2026/03506

Site Address: Manor Farm, Sopworth, SN14 6PS.

Proposal: Change of Use of 3 no. agricultural buildings to flexible commercial use falling within Use Class E with ancillary storage.

Date of Consultation Response: 01/07/2026

I refer to the above prior approval Part 3 Class R application dated 03/06/2026 seeking permission for a change of use of 3 no. agricultural buildings to flexible commercial use falling within use class E with ancillary storage.

The site is located with existing access onto a C classified section of public highway subject to a speed limit of 60mph. There are no proposed alterations to the access with the public highway.

The proposals seek permission for a change of use of 3 agricultural buildings to flexible commercial use within use class E with ancillary storage. A Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted with the application.

The TS identifies a number of relevant documents/policies at national and local level. The site and adjacent highway network are discussed, identifying the existing access and PROWs in the vicinity. Highway Safety in the locale is discussed with Personal Injury Collision Data being reviewed and demonstrating that in the most recent 5-year period there have been no identified collisions. Existing traffic flows and speeds have been identified through ATC surveys detailing the low-level traffic on the lane and the average speeds are also recorded as low at under 30mph for the 85th percentile in either direction. The site has been discussed in terms of sustainable travel and it is recognised that the rural location does lack dedicated infrastructure, however there are opportunities to travel by modes other than the private motor vehicle albeit those identified are limited, it is therefore considered that the site would likely be reliant on the use of the private motor vehicle for access.

The TS then goes on to discuss the proposals against the existing permitted use, which would have had unrestricted agricultural use, and as such would have the potential to attract larger vehicles associated with agricultural operations. Visibility at the access is discussed in regard to the 85th percentile speeds on the road and demonstrated at an appropriate level.

There are additional plans within the TS identifying proposed access improvements but not as part of the application. These entail either relocating the south side wall further within the site or reducing the height to below 0.9m, as well as removing an existing tree. As these do not form part of the application the proposed alterations to the access would be required to be submitted as a full application. It is unclear the existing height of the wall, but I would not consider that it exceeds 1.2m and therefore in terms of visibility the splays shown demonstrate it is achievable in line with the requirements for the 85th percentile speeds recorded on the public highway. Swept path analysis has been provided and demonstrates the access accommodates movements from the largest vehicle requiring access to the site.

Vehicle parking for the proposals is discussed with a view to providing parking in accordance with standards, for the proposed E class use as a commercial facility (offices/light industry) an optimum standard of 1 space per 30sqm is expected. The floor areas disclosed for the barns is, Barn A – 401.28sqm, Barn B – 265.35sqm and Barn C – 282.14sqm, this equates to some 948.77sqm. The total floor area would require some 32 vehicle parking spaces as a

maximum and given the remote nature of the proposals in terms of access by other modes, it would be likely that this maximum provision would be a requirement to prevent any displaced vehicles onto the public highway.

The parking provision and access improvements are stated as not included within the application and it discloses within the TS that this would be part of a further application, the proposed omission of parking at this stage leaves no guarantee that parking would be provided for the site in the future and unless parking is provided or conditioned then I would be required to recommend refusal on the basis of lack of parking. Additionally, the access improvements proposed appear to provide visibility splays which are not secured through this application and as such cannot be guaranteed on what would be considered an intensified use of the access.

The principle of the redevelopment of the site to provide Commercial Class E facilities, particularly office and light industry is not considered a significant impact on the surrounding highway network in terms of capacity if the lack of parking and the access improvements can be addressed appropriately.

If you have any queries regarding the above advice, please contact:

HighwaysDevelopment@wiltshire.gov.uk

Appendix B – Railton TN

Technical Note 01B

Project: Manor Farm, Sopworth

Subject: Transport Review

Client: Local Resident

Prepared by: Bruce Bamber BSc MA MSc MCIHT

Date: 06/07/2026

Introduction

1. This Technical Note considers transport and sustainability matters with regard to a Class R planning application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed change of use of agricultural buildings for commercial use.
2. Bruce Bamber is Director of Railton TPC Ltd and has worked for over 35 years in the transport planning industry. He has dealt with the transport and access arrangements for a wide range of development types from local to strategic scale and has been involved with numerous transport studies for public and private sector clients. He has given evidence at informal hearings and public inquiries, participated in Local Plan Inquiries and at a DCO Hearing. He is a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
3. A Transport Statement (TS) has been submitted in support of the application (Rappor, May 2026). The content of this report has been assessed. The author has also undertaken a site visit and met with local residents to better understand local transport concerns.
4. The following sections consider the issues of trip generation, transport sustainability, access arrangements and parking provision.
5. These issues are considered in the context of Paragraphs 109 and 110 of the NPPF that seek to achieve sustainable transport, Paragraph 115 that requires the provision of safe and suitable access, Paragraph 116 that related to highway safety and Paragraph 117 that deals with active travel, public transport and the efficient delivery of goods.

Car Trip Generation

6. The TS sets out trip generation rates for office and light industrial uses and applies these rates to proposed floor areas to arrive at numbers of cars generated in the 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 peak hours (TS, Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3).

7. The source trip generation rates are derived from the TRICS database and details are provided in Appendices H and I of the TS.
8. Scrutiny of the TRICS data reveals the following areas of concern:
 - Of the four selected office sites, three are identified as being at 'edge of town' locations and one is identified as being situated in a 'neighbourhood centre'. These sites do not reflect the rural nature of the proposed development;
 - The office sites have between 350 and 2,307 people living within 500m and between 5,000 and 20,000 people within 1 mile. The surrounding populations at the survey sites are therefore far in excess of the population around the proposed development site;
 - Of the four selected light industrial sites, three are identified as being at 'edge of town' locations and one is identified as being situated in a 'neighbourhood centre';
 - The light industrial sites have between 75 and 1,497 people living within 500m and between 1,000 and 10,000 people within 1 mile. The surrounding populations at the survey sites are therefore in excess of the population around the proposed development site.
9. All of the survey sites are in more urban settings with far greater population density within walking distance than the Sopworth site. Urban settings are provided with much higher levels of provision for pedestrians (footways, crossings), cyclists and public transport than the village of Sopworth and thus provide greater opportunities to travel by means other than the private car (see below).
10. The unrepresentative nature of the source trip generation surveys leads to the conclusion that the level of car use at the proposed site is likely to have been underestimated.

HGV Trip Generation

11. Light industrial uses can generate significant numbers of larger vehicles. The TS provides no assessment of the potential for the site to generate larger vehicles.
12. The presence of larger vehicles has the potential to lead to adverse amenity and safety impacts. These are discussed further below.

Transport Sustainability

13. The following paragraphs assess the accessibility of the site by sustainable modes

14. **Walking:** Only the village of Sopworth is within walking distance of the site. It is likely that the number of employees at the proposed development living in Sopworth would be zero or extremely low.
15. No other villages are within a reasonable walking distance of the site and none of the lanes connecting the site to surrounding areas are provided with footways.
16. The applicant does not propose any improvement to off-site pedestrian facilities.
17. **Cycling:** Within a maximum reasonable cycling distance of 5 miles there are only villages. Cycling would be via unlit, often narrow and winding, country lanes with no provision for cyclists. Many of the surrounding lanes are of insufficient width to allow a car to safely pass a cyclist.
18. The lack of urban centres within cycling distance and the poor quality of potential cycling routes indicates that very few employees would live within cycling distance and of them, only an extremely small proportion would be prepared to regularly use the available cycling routes.
19. **Buses:** The village has one school bus service. There is no opportunity for potential employees to travel by public transport and no improvements to public transport are proposed.
20. **Trains:** No train stations are available in the local area.
21. **Existing Mode Share:** The following table provides an indication of the existing mode of travel used by employees in the local area:

Table 1: Census Mode of Travel to Work (2011) (People working in and around Sopworth)

Mode	%
On foot	9.3%
By bicycle	2.2%
Bus	1.9%
Train	1.0%
Car driver	79.8%
Car passenger	4.8%
Motorcycle	1.0%
Total	100.0%

Source: Nomis Table WD703EW for Wiltshire 005 super output area – middle layer

22. A car driver mode share of 79.8% is extremely high. The data are only available for the middle layer output area that includes larger settlements in the vicinity such as Sherston, Alderton, Hullavington and the fringes of Malmesbury. These settlements provide much greater opportunity to walk, cycle and use public transport than Sopworth and the results are therefore skewed by the more sustainable travel patterns elsewhere in the area. The car driver mode share for employment in Sopworth would therefore be significantly higher than for the census area as a whole.
23. Paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework relates to transport sustainability:

*'110. The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. **Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.** This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.'* (**emphasis added**)

24. Journeys between the development and employees' homes would be almost entirely dependent on the private car. For those working within the development, there are no facilities within walking distance in the village. All journeys to use facilities, for example, at lunchtime, would therefore also be by private car. It is clear from the assessment of opportunities for employees to travel by sustainable modes that the need to travel is not limited and there is not a genuine choice of transport modes available for the vast majority of trips.
25. The latter part of Paragraph 110 recognises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport vary between urban and rural areas. This is true but focuses attention on the key issue which is that this is an inappropriate location for significant numbers of employees. The fact that there are differences between rural and urban areas does not negate the fundamental policy conflict of locating significant numbers of jobs, that would attract employees from over a wide area, where it is impossible to walk or use public transport and cycling is difficult and hazardous.
26. It is therefore considered that the proposals are not in accordance with Paragraph 110 of the NPPF.
27. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF is also relevant to this proposal:

'115. In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

a. sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;

b. safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;

c. the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code⁴⁸; and

d. any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach'. (emphasis added)

28. It has been shown that sustainable modes are not prioritised. It is also clear that there is no sustainable transport vision for the site, and that the scale and type of development in this location is inappropriate in terms of sustainable transport. The proposed development does not, therefore comply with Paragraph 115 of the NPPF.

29. A further policy conflict is evident from the fact that safe and suitable access to the site cannot be achieved for all users. The lack of any safe pedestrian routes from surrounding areas and the narrowness of surrounding lanes would make travel on foot or by bicycle hazardous.

30. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF states:

'117. Within this context, applications for development should:

a. give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;

b. address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport;

c. create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards;

d. allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles; and

e. be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.' (emphasis added)

31. The proposed development conflicts with this Paragraph for the same reasons; a lack of sustainable access.

32. It is concluded that the site's isolated location with little population within walking distance and an absence of public transport leads to the conclusion that the proposals are contrary to Paragraphs 110, 115 and 117 of the NPPF.

Low Standard of Surrounding Highways

33. The level of trip generation of the proposed development would not lead to links or junctions operating over capacity. However, the highway network around Sopworth is of a very low standard.
34. There are four lanes leading to the village arranged approximately around the points of the compass. The lanes to the north and west connect with the A433. The lane to the east connects with Sherston and the lane to the south leads to Luckington.
35. All of these lanes have sections where two light vehicles are unable to pass and therefore operate as a single lane with passing places. All the lanes have tight bends that limit forward visibility. In such circumstances, even relatively small increases in traffic levels can lead to adverse safety impacts as drivers are forced to stop suddenly and, in some circumstances, reverse in locations where oncoming vehicles have limited ability to react.
36. The lanes are used by pedestrians, recreational cyclists and equestrians. The Highway Code states that drivers should allow a minimum 2.0m separation between their vehicle and a pedestrian or an equestrian and 1.5m for cyclists¹. Pedestrians and cyclists take up around 0.5m and an equestrian takes up around 1.0m. The absolute minimum width of road required for a car to safely pass a pedestrian is therefore 4.5m, to pass a cyclists it is 5.0m and to pass an equestrian it is 5.5m. Many sections of the surrounding lanes do not allow for these safe margins to be achieved.
37. It is concluded that the use of the surrounding lanes by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians; vulnerable highway users, makes them highly sensitive to changes in traffic levels. The development of an employment site attracting significant numbers of vehicles in this location raises concerns regarding vulnerable highway users in terms of amenity and safety.

Access Arrangements

38. The proposed site access arrangements are shown on Drawing 3001 Rev. P01 that is attached as Appendix E of the TS.
39. The access drawing shows visibility splays to the north and south from a point 2.4m back from the edge of the main carriageway in the centre of the site access. The visibility splays are shown as 40.4m to the north and 41.6m to the south. These are calculated from observed 85th percentile vehicle speeds of 28.1mph southbound and 28.7mph northbound.

¹ See paragraph 163 of Highway Code

40. In order to achieve safe visibility to the south, it is proposed to remove an existing tree and to realign the wall to ensure that it does not obstruct visibility². These works are indicated on the drawing in Appendix E of the TS.
41. Visibility to the north is shown measured to the centre of the road. This is not standard practice as visibility is generally measured to the nearside kerb to ensure that the whole of the road at a point at the safe visibility distance is visible to a driver seeking to turn out of the access.
42. Paragraph 5.17 of the TS suggests that measuring visibility to the centreline can be appropriate and refers to paragraph 10.5.5 of Manual for Streets 2 (MfS2) (Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, September 2010). This states:
- '10.5.5 Some circumstances make it unlikely that vehicles approaching from the left on the main arm will cross the centreline of the main arm – opposing flows may be physically segregated at that point, for example. If so, the visibility splay to the left can be measured to the centreline of the main arm' (MfS2, para. 10.5.5)*
43. There is no physical segregation on the lane and it is therefore possible that a vehicle could be approaching on the wrong side of the road. Indeed, vehicles, including motorcycles may cut the corner (or be forced onto the southern side of the road by parking on the northern side) and thus be more likely to completely or partially obscure the view to the north. The visibility to the kerb rather than to the centre of the road is measured as 33.3m, significantly less than the safe minimum.
44. The following photograph, taken on site, shows the view to the left from the site access from a point 2.4m back from the give-way line:

²Paragraph 5.18 of the TA suggests that visibility could be achieved either by relocating the wall behind the visibility splay as indicated on Drawing 3001 Rev. P01 or by reducing the height of the wall to 0.9m. The latter would not be acceptable since visibility splays should be entirely within highway land. The wider verge created by relocating the wall behind the visibility splay would need to be adopted as highway.

Photo 1: Visibility to the Left for Driver Leaving the Site



45. It is clear from the photograph that visibility is restricted by the presence of a high wall.
46. The drawing in Appendix E includes a note relating to the visibility splay to the north stating, '*On street parking potentially obstructing visibility*'. The photograph above shows a car parked within on the visibility splay. It is understood that up to three vehicles can be parked partly on the footway and partly on the carriageway on the section adjacent to the wall shown above. These vehicles lead to a significant blind spot that inhibits the ability of a driver leaving the site to see oncoming vehicles.
47. This safety issue is not discussed in the body of the report and no measures are proposed to ensure that the visibility splay is kept free of obstruction. A vehicle or vehicles parked in this area will significantly reduce visibility and lead to an unacceptable highway safety impact. The issue engages Paragraph 116 of the NPPF that states, '*Development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety...*'.
48. On the basis of the above, it is concluded that it is not possible to provide safe visibility splays for the proposed access and the proposed development should therefore be refused on highway safety grounds.
49. It should be noted that the proposed development will lead to a very substantial intensification of use of the access compared to its former agricultural uses. The agricultural buildings are associated with Manor Farm whose land lies to the west of the site. Much of the day-to-day activity would therefore have been between the

buildings and land to the west via the existing farm track that leads to the fields. These movements would not have used the access onto the lane.

50. Notwithstanding the use of the farm track, the number of cars using the access would be far in excess of the number that might be associated with agricultural uses and the proposed light industrial uses will generate larger vehicles. The site would also attract larger vehicles associated with deliveries and servicing. There is not a compelling argument that the proposed development would lead to a reduction in the level of use compared to historic levels.

Parking

51. The TS does not provide any detail on the proposed parking provision except to state that, *'the development will comply with the relevant [Wiltshire Council] parking standards and guidance'* (para. 5.26 of TS).
52. A parking standard of one car parking space per 30sqm of development is cited as the current standard for offices. The proposed development has an area of around 951 sqm (see Section 6 of TS). This would require around 30 car parking spaces.
53. The only realistic spaces that could be used for parking are those between the buildings bordering the northern and southern boundaries of the site. These spaces could accommodate an absolute maximum of around 20 spaces albeit with sub-standard manoeuvring space. It is likely that the requirements to gain access to the buildings would reduce this figure significantly.
54. It is concluded that the planning application boundary does not provide sufficient space to accommodate the necessary level of parking and is likely to lead to unsafe parking on the access road or on the external highway.

Conclusion

55. This Technical Note reviews transport information submitted in support of a planning application relating to a change of use of agricultural buildings at Manor Farm, Sopworth.
56. Scrutiny of the methodology used to derive peak hour car trip generation rates for the proposed development is likely to under-estimate the number of vehicles generated because the sites where observations have been undertaken are either at the edge of towns or in neighbourhood centres rather than in isolated rural locations comparable with the proposed development.

57. The applicant has undertaken no assessment of the possible level of generation of larger vehicles associated with the site.
58. The site has extremely poor levels of access by sustainable modes. The site would be almost entirely car-dependent.
59. The lanes providing access to the site are used by vulnerable highway users (pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians) and include sections that are of insufficient width to allow a vehicle to pass while allowing a safe margin of separation. The introduction of a significant generator of additional vehicle movements in this location raises highway safety concerns.
60. The visibility splay to the north from the site access is measured to the centre of the road rather than to the nearside kerb as would normally be the requirement. This approach is not justified and creates a blind spot that has adverse highway safety implications.
61. The applicant fails to acknowledge that vehicles park within the proposed visibility splay to the north. This is a serious highway safety issue.
62. The deficiency of visibility to the north represent an unacceptable highway safety impact. The application should be refused on this basis in accordance with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF. Further highway safety concerns relate to the conflict between site generated traffic and vulnerable highway users on the surrounding narrow lanes.
63. The site area as defined by the application red line falls far short of that required to accommodate the level of parking that would need to be provided to meet relevant standards. It is likely that site users would be forced to park in inappropriate and potentially dangerous locations.
64. Overall it is concluded that the proposed development is unacceptable for highway safety reasons (NPPF Paragraph 116) and fails to comply with policy requiring safe and suitable access (NPPF Paragraph 115) and policy that seeks to deliver sustainable development in transport terms (NPPF Paragraphs 109, 110, 115 and 117).

Appendix C - TRICS Report

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

TRIP RATE CALCULATION SELECTION PARAMETERS:

Land Use: 02 - EMPLOYMENT

Category: C - INDUSTRIAL UNIT

Selected Vehicle Type: Total Vehicles

**BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period*

Selected regions and areas:

08	NORTH WEST		
	LC	LANCASHIRE	1 day
09	NORTH		
	CU	CUMBERLAND	1 day
13	MUNSTER		
	KE	KERRY	1 day
14	LEINSTER		
	WC	WICKLOW	1 day

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS® sub-region in the selected set.

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Primary Filtering Selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Parameter:	GFA
Actual Range:	150 to 968 (units:sqm)
Range Selected by User:	150 to 1000 (units:sqm)
Parking Spaces Range:	3 - 1378

Public Transport Provision:	
Selection by:	All Surveys Included
Date Range:	01/01/10 to 03/06/25

This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

Monday	1 days
Thursday	2 days
Friday	1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.

Selected survey types:

Manual count	4
Direction ATC Count	0

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaken using machines

Selected Locations:

Edge of Town	3 days
Neighbourhood Centre	1 days

This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known.

Selected Location Sub Categories:

Industrial Zone	3 days
Village	1 days

This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

Inclusion of Servicing Vehicle Counts:

Servicing vehicles Unknown	4 days
----------------------------	--------

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Secondary Filtering Selection:

Use Class:

Not Known

4 surveys

This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order (England) 2020 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS®.

Population within 500m Range:

75 - 1497

Population within 1 mile:

1,001 to 5,000

2 surveys

5,001 to 10,000

2 surveys

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.

Population within 5 miles:

5,001 to 25,000

1 surveys

25,001 to 50,000

1 surveys

50,001 to 75,000

1 surveys

75,001 to 100,000

1 surveys

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5-mile radii of population.

Car ownership within 5 miles:

0.6 to 1.0

3 surveys

1.1 to 1.5

1 surveys

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5-miles of selected survey sites.

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Petrol filling station:

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that include petrol filling station activity, and the number of surveys that do not.

Travel Plan:

No 4 surveys

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

No PTAL Present 4 surveys

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set by PTAL rating category.

COVID-19 Restrictions:

No

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

1 BLACKDYKE ROAD CARLISLE KINGSTOWN IND. ESTATE Edge of Town Industrial Zone Gross floor area: 715.00 sqm Survey date: Friday 15/10/2021	CU-02-C-01	STEEL FABRICATION	CUMBERLAND	Survey Type: Unknown
2 WOODLANDS ROAD KILLARNEY Edge of Town Industrial Zone Gross floor area: 600.00 sqm Survey date: Thursday 17/10/2019	KE-02-C-01	PRINT & GRAPHIC DESIGN	KERRY	Survey Type: Unknown
3 TOLLGATE ROAD BURSCOUGH Edge of Town Industrial Zone Gross floor area: 700.00 sqm Survey date: Thursday 21/04/2022	LC-02-C-06	STEEL FABRICATION	LANCASHIRE	Survey Type: Unknown
4 CHARVEY LANE RÁTHNEW COMMONS Neighbourhood Centre Village Gross floor area: 968.00 sqm Survey date: Monday 28/05/2018	WC-02-C-01	FOAM INSULATION	WICKLOW	Survey Type: Unknown

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/C - INDUSTRIAL UNIT

Total Vehicles

Calculation factor: 100 sqm

*BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

Time Range	No. Days	Ave. GFA	Arrivals	Departures	Totals
00:00-01:00					
01:00-02:00					
02:00-03:00					
03:00-04:00					
04:00-05:00					
05:00-06:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
06:00-07:00	1	700	0.429	0.143	0.572
07:00-08:00	4	746	0.335	0.067	0.402
08:00-09:00	4	746	0.335	0.201	0.536
09:00-10:00	4	746	0.335	0.302	0.637
10:00-11:00	4	746	0.503	0.369	0.872
11:00-12:00	4	746	0.302	0.369	0.671
12:00-13:00	4	746	0.335	0.335	0.670
13:00-14:00	4	746	0.335	0.335	0.670
14:00-15:00	4	746	0.402	0.369	0.771
15:00-16:00	4	746	0.436	0.536	0.972
16:00-17:00	4	746	0.168	0.335	0.503
17:00-18:00	4	746	0.168	0.402	0.570
18:00-19:00	4	746	0.034	0.101	0.135
19:00-20:00	1	700	0.000	0.143	0.143
20:00-21:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
21:00-22:00					
22:00-23:00					
23:00-00:00					
Total Rates:			4.117	4.007	8.124

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: $COUNT/TRP*FACT$. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]



Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Parameter Summary:

Trip rate parameter range selected:	150 - 1000 (units: sqm)
Survey date date range:	28/05/2018 - 21/04/2022
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	4
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	0
Surveys manually removed from selection:	0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/C - INDUSTRIAL UNIT

OGVs

Calculation factor: 100 sqm

*BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

Time Range	No. Days	Ave. GFA	Arrivals	Departures	Totals
00:00-01:00					
01:00-02:00					
02:00-03:00					
03:00-04:00					
04:00-05:00					
05:00-06:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
06:00-07:00	1	700	0.143	0.143	0.286
07:00-08:00	4	746	0.067	0.034	0.101
08:00-09:00	4	746	0.034	0.067	0.101
09:00-10:00	4	746	0.000	0.000	0.000
10:00-11:00	4	746	0.101	0.101	0.202
11:00-12:00	4	746	0.000	0.000	0.000
12:00-13:00	4	746	0.034	0.000	0.034
13:00-14:00	4	746	0.000	0.034	0.034
14:00-15:00	4	746	0.034	0.034	0.068
15:00-16:00	4	746	0.067	0.067	0.134
16:00-17:00	4	746	0.034	0.034	0.068
17:00-18:00	4	746	0.000	0.000	0.000
18:00-19:00	4	746	0.000	0.000	0.000
19:00-20:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
20:00-21:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
21:00-22:00					
22:00-23:00					
23:00-00:00					
Total Rates:			0.514	0.514	1.028

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: $COUNT/TRP*FACT$. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]



Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Parameter Summary:

Trip rate parameter range selected:	150 - 1000 (units: sqm)
Survey date date range:	28/05/2018 - 21/04/2022
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	3
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	0
Surveys manually removed from selection:	0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/C - INDUSTRIAL UNIT

Cars

Calculation factor: 100 sqm

*BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

Time Range	No. Days	Ave. GFA	Arrivals	Departures	Totals
00:00-01:00					
01:00-02:00					
02:00-03:00					
03:00-04:00					
04:00-05:00					
05:00-06:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
06:00-07:00	1	700	0.143	0.000	0.143
07:00-08:00	4	746	0.168	0.000	0.168
08:00-09:00	4	746	0.134	0.067	0.201
09:00-10:00	4	746	0.168	0.134	0.302
10:00-11:00	4	746	0.235	0.101	0.336
11:00-12:00	4	746	0.101	0.168	0.269
12:00-13:00	4	746	0.134	0.168	0.302
13:00-14:00	4	746	0.201	0.168	0.369
14:00-15:00	4	746	0.101	0.067	0.168
15:00-16:00	4	746	0.168	0.268	0.436
16:00-17:00	4	746	0.034	0.168	0.202
17:00-18:00	4	746	0.101	0.201	0.302
18:00-19:00	4	746	0.034	0.067	0.101
19:00-20:00	1	700	0.000	0.143	0.143
20:00-21:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
21:00-22:00					
22:00-23:00					
23:00-00:00					
Total Rates:			1.722	1.720	3.442

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: $COUNT/TRP \times FACT$. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]



Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Parameter Summary:

Trip rate parameter range selected:	150 - 1000 (units: sqm)
Survey date date range:	28/05/2018 - 21/04/2022
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	4
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	0
Surveys manually removed from selection:	0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/C - INDUSTRIAL UNIT

LGVs

Calculation factor: 100 sqm

*BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

Time Range	No. Days	Ave. GFA	Arrivals	Departures	Totals
00:00-01:00					
01:00-02:00					
02:00-03:00					
03:00-04:00					
04:00-05:00					
05:00-06:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
06:00-07:00	1	700	0.143	0.000	0.143
07:00-08:00	4	746	0.101	0.034	0.135
08:00-09:00	4	746	0.168	0.067	0.235
09:00-10:00	4	746	0.168	0.168	0.336
10:00-11:00	4	746	0.168	0.168	0.336
11:00-12:00	4	746	0.201	0.201	0.402
12:00-13:00	4	746	0.168	0.168	0.336
13:00-14:00	4	746	0.134	0.134	0.268
14:00-15:00	4	746	0.268	0.268	0.536
15:00-16:00	4	746	0.201	0.201	0.402
16:00-17:00	4	746	0.101	0.134	0.235
17:00-18:00	4	746	0.067	0.201	0.268
18:00-19:00	4	746	0.000	0.034	0.034
19:00-20:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
20:00-21:00	1	700	0.000	0.000	0.000
21:00-22:00					
22:00-23:00					
23:00-00:00					
Total Rates:			1.888	1.778	3.666

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: $COUNT/TRP \times FACT$. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]



Audit Code: 267bf3e7-fb91-4a40-b139-b833c3a2b166

Parameter Summary:

Trip rate parameter range selected:	150 - 1000 (units: sqm)
Survey date date range:	28/05/2018 - 21/04/2022
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):	4
Number of Saturdays:	0
Number of Sundays:	0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:	0
Surveys manually removed from selection:	0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Appendix D - Parking Plan



rappor



Rappor Consultants Ltd

www.rappor.co.uk

Cheltenham
Bristol
London
Bedford
Exeter
Hereford
Manchester
Cambridge
Birmingham
Leeds

