Morning John,

The proposal is for a multi-use site utilising existing mill buildings on a compact site. Vehicular access is restricted to the mill yard located off Greenacre Street which is subject to one way working in an east-west direction. Limited frontage access can be gained from Woone Lane which is currently 2-way but this will be changed to one way (south to north) in the near future. Two additional accesses are proposed as part of the development, a delivery access off Woone Lane and off Mearley street to the east which will require the construction of a bridge over Mearley Brook.

Opposite the Greenacre Street access is a primary school catering for a roll of 281 pupils. Moving to the contents of the Transport Assessment (TA), I propose to work through the document highlighting areas of concern.

**Vehicular access.**

As mentioned above there is an access point located off Greenacre Street and a further access proposed off Mearley Street. The Greenacre Street entrance is likely to experience congestion especially at the start and finish of the primary school opposite. The Mearley Street access requires the construction of a bridge over the brook. The bridge would remain a private asset (unadopted) which will allow access controls to be incorporated into the final design to control the entry and exit movements which would be necessary to reduce the likelihood of conflicts along Mearley Street which is narrow and only suitable for single way working. However, within the TA the bridge is also being promoted as a pedestrian route but pedestrian users are not accommodated on the bridge itself and the footway on Mearley Street is restricted to a narrow footway along one side only which was partially obstructed by parked vehicles during the course of my visit. I would also mention that the adjacent Honda Garage has a service ramp access on to Mearley Street adjacent to the brook. This has a gate which opens across Mearley Street which, if it was to remain, would obstruct access over the bridge.

The delivery access proposed onto Woone Lane does not allow vehicles to enter/leave in a forward gear and this would be a likely source of congestion as vehicles manoeuvre in/out of the access.

**Parking Provision.**

Using the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan Parking Standards as a guide to the required parking provision for the site the various land uses would attract maximum parking levels as follows:

- 410msq A3 Bar and Restaurant @ 1:8 = 51 spaces
- 505msq B1c Brewery and Barrel Store @ 1:30 = 17 spaces
- 305msq A3 Brewery Tap @ 1:8 = 38 spaces
- 161msq D1 Engine House (museum) @1:30 = 5 spaces
- 65msq A1 Coffee, beer, wine shop food retail @ 1:14 = 5 spaces
- 177msq B1c Bakery @1:30 = 6 spaces
- 305msq D1 Public Hall @1:12 = 25 spaces
- 720msq B1b Office @ 1:33 = 21 spaces
This is perhaps the most concerning aspect of the development proposal. The above table does not incorporate any discounting for linked trips or splitting the parking requirements to those which attract predominantly daytime / night time users. However, I do not think it appropriate to suggest in the TA that "many of the visitors and customers will be already shopping within the town centre and will therefore visit the new development as part of an existing trip to the town centre" S 3.3.2. Some visitors may venture out of the town centre and visit the retail and food and drink outlets there are some uses such as the gym, pool, hotel and office which will generate non-linked trips from the resident populations of Clitheroe and the surrounding areas for which the private car will be considered the most appropriate travel mode and parking will inevitably take place in the surrounding residential streets.

Section 3.3.4 suggests that there is alternative parking located at Sainsbury's and Whalley Road and Mitchell Street P&D Car parks. The Sainsbury's car park is privately owned and maintained and should not be considered as being available to the users of the proposed development. The Whalley Road car park is run by the local authority as a long stay car park (34 spaces) and during the course of my recent site visit it was full and unlikely to present an alternative parking resource for the development. The Mitchell Street car park is run by the local authority as a long stay car park (26 spaces). The car park was lightly used during my visit although its location would suggest that it is there to provide parking facilities for the adjacent recreation ground. Due to the time of the year (winter) the observed usage is unlikely to reflect the summer demand. Any seasonal variations in the car park usage could be confirmed from the car park receipts.

Opportunities for on street parking in the immediate vicinity of the development are limited due to the existing demand for and will be further reduced when the additional waiting restriction are implemented on Woone Lane to tie in with the one way working. There is some discounting to be applied in respect of linked trips to the development and daytime / evening usage patterns, which should be provided by the developer, nevertheless the scale of the development would suggest that even with the discounting applied the limited on-site parking would be massively oversubscribed.

Deliveries and Servicing.
Currently the servicing to the mill is taken from Greenacre Street. The applicant proposes to construct a bridge across Mearley Brook (from Mearley Street) to provide additional servicing (and pedestrian access). As mentioned previously, Mearley Street is narrow and the route may therefore experience congestion which could impact on the Whalley Road mini roundabout. The inclusion of onsite parking within the mill yard may impact on the ability of service vehicles to enter / leave in a forward gear. It would therefore be necessary for the applicant to submit appropriate swept path plans catering for all likely vehicle types to ensure that access / egress is not affected. The servicing access off Woone Lane has already been mentioned and may have an adverse effect on through traffic.

Pedestrian and Cycle Access.
Although the applicant is promoting linked pedestrian trips in the submitted TA there is little proposed which actively promotes this, save for the construction of the bridge which has poor pedestrian links and no separate provision over the brook. Pedestrian crossing facilities along Whalley Road / Moor Lane are not being enhanced and the existing facilities are not suitably located for the appropriate desire lines to encourage pedestrian trips. Links from the residential areas of Queensway / Waterloo Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Space Type</th>
<th>Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2310msq</td>
<td>Leisure @1:24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784msq</td>
<td>Non-food retail @1:22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>@ 1 per Bedroom</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There have been 2 cycle injury collisions in the vicinity of the site and whilst the applicants suggest that cycling is an attractive modal choice no measures have been suggested to improve cycle safety or encourage cycling to the site.

**Traffic Impact Analysis.**

The TA has provided only trip rates for approx. 53% of the proposed fitness club, it has excluded the ground floor area with reception, changing rooms and swimming pool, I consider these should be included in the trip generation. Using the full fitness club GFA the revised trips should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arr</th>
<th>Dep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a big increase on the proposed figures. This will also have a knock on effect in relation to parking demand for this aspect of the development.

Also they have excluded ALL other development at the site, these should be included but with linked trip discounting for the impact on the wider highway network. Without discounting, but excluding any traffic generation caused by the coffee shop and the engine shed, the traffic generation would be expected to be closer to;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arr</th>
<th>Dep</th>
<th>2-way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These trip rates can then be discounted for linked trips using more than one facility on site. The development's location to other sites within the town centre may exclude it from full discounting from all other town centre retail/leisure/tourism uses. The developer should do this using suitable discount rates with explanations of why the specific rates were used and which aspects of the development would be the secondary generators.

A realistic level of trip generation will need to be agreed before any capacity analysis of the surrounding highway network nodes can take place, however it should be noted that the junction of A671/B6478/Mearley Street has been excluded from the TA. I would have thought that this would have been an important junction to model for capacity analysis, especially considering the proposal to use Mearley Street as a (possibly unsuitable at 2.5m width) vehicular access to the site.

**Committed Developments.**

The applicant has not identified any committed developments in the area but I would suggest that this is not the case as there are a number of residential developments on the south / south westerly sides of Clitheroe Town Centre which will invariably impact on the roads surrounding the development and therefore this area of the TA and its potential impacts should be revisited.

**Conclusion**

There is a major concern regarding the lack of on-site parking and the potentially damaging effect that the extra parking demand will have on highway safety and residential amenity of the surrounding highway network. Whilst I would accept a level of discounting the calculations / reasoning will need to be presented as part of the TA appraisal.
The impact of the traffic generated by the site has been grossly underestimated and the junction capacity analysis needs to be re-done (including the Mearley Street / Whalley Road junction) and they need to include the impacts of the various committed developments in the area.
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