

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

15<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2019

**ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS**

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
<b>PART A</b>		
19/0150/FULL	14	Application <b>DEFERRED</b>
<b>PART B</b>		
19/0080/FULL	40	<p><u>Highway Authority</u> : Additional comments - As you are aware there is an overarching principle to limit the need to travel and offer a genuine choice of transport modes, this need to be read against NPPF 84 and 103. It is always going to be a challenge in rural communities to exploit sustainable transport opportunities and in practice means that development should focus around established communities what has supporting services. In the case of this proposal there are some things that you can do to help improve non car based trips, but the locational limitations are not addressable.</p> <p>You correctly identify that the Bewdley Business Park is 2.4km away from the site and this provides employment opportunities. This distance does exceed the industry standing maximum walking distance which places it conflict with best practice guidance and it exceeds the average walking trip distances from the 2017 National Travel Survey. When I consider the "quality" of the walking route I find this to be lacking, the variable width and lack of lighting is a disincentive plus the need to cross the A456. My conclusion is that whilst some people may choose to walk the extra distance and that there is a footway given the distance and route quality it is unlikely that it will occur particularly in times of inclement weather. Cycling has similar challenges in term of route quality, but cycling does allow for a greater level of access to services and the distance is achievable, however I would suggest that because of the environment only the most confident of cyclists would be willing to make this trip</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>I note the incentive provision of £1500 towards an electric bike (or car), this is a welcome provision and is commendable, but it does not trip the balance in favour in my opinion. Clearly there is a question of how to ensure that this would occur in the event of a planning consent being issued and I question whether a planning obligation is needed to address this. This does not improve the quality of the local walking/cycling network.</p> <p>We have also considered access to schools and retail services, all of which have the same challenges.</p> <p>Bus access is limited, but it is accepted that it exists. The 291 service currently provides a 08:02 service to Kidderminster, and 17:20 return, this is the only realist commuter service available. There would be opportunities to provide free or discounted bus travel which could make this a more attractive proposition which could be explored further. The walking distance to a bus stop is 400m, therefore only the Bliss Gate stops are likely to be used.</p> <p>Bus to school options do exist but we must recognise that as the routes are restricted and distances great the County Council has to fund those school bus places and due to the CIL regulations this proposal cannot make financial support, as such the development will place financial burden on the Local Authority, and whilst this is not a planning reason for refusal in its own right there is a question over the long term viability of services as a result of this. These services should not be relied on to address other accessibility shortcomings.</p> <p>The leisure facilities are a limited range and again suffer from route quality issues, I do not place much weight on the proximity as my focus is on key destinations of education and employment.</p> <p>The welcome pack is welcomed, but this would be expected of all developments so does not add any additional benefits.</p>

REFERENCE NO.	PAGE	ADDENDA AND CORRECTIONS
		<p>My conclusion based on the additional information is that there is a footway to the Bewdley Business Park, and it could be cycled, however it is unlikely to offer a realistic choice for most people. It is also just one destination so we cannot assume that it is the sole employment destination. Access by active travel to most destinations is unlikely, bus access to Kidderminster is possible but not actively promoted, financial incentives are welcomed but are unlikely to reduce employment or education trips by car.</p> <p>I remain unconvinced that there is a genuine choice of transport modes, and whilst some improvements can be made they cannot address the inherent problem of distance to a wider range of services and facilities.</p> <p>If you want to further refine the bus opportunity I consider that the appeal of the site would improve and it would be to the benefit of future occupants, but I am satisfied that the overall objection on sustainability should remain.</p>