MBC
traffic
engineers
&
transport
planners

ULEY PARISH COUNCIL

APPRAISAL OF THE OPERATION OF SOUTH STREET ULEY

Technical Report 22325/1
July 2026

Mark Baker
Consulting
Limited

32 Montpelier Court
Station Road
Montpelier
Bristol BS6 5EA
Tel: 0117 924 6994

Email: mbctraffic@gmail.com

Directors:
M Baker
BSc CEng MICE FCIT FILT EurIng
T J Baker

Registered in England and Wales 6028435
Registered office as above.

CONTENTS

Preamble

1. This Appraisal has been commissioned by Uley Parish Council (the Parish Council) to provide an independent "*Appraisal of the Operation of South Street Uley*" (Appraisal). The Parish Council's brief for the work being:

> *"To carry out an unbiased professional appraisal of pedestrian and vehicle safety, parking provision and access for emergency vehicles along the length of South Street from the junction with The Street to the footpath that runs down from the school at the far end of The Knoll. All this with particular reference to drop-off and pick-up times at Uley Primary School and use of the road by delivery vehicles. In addition to assess the potential impact of the development at The Knoll of 18 one, two and three-bedroom units to house 63 people."*

2. The Appraisal being to consider the existing operation of South Street by all types of movements along its length from its northern end at its junction with The Street through to the east past the pedestrian access to the Millennium Green. The plate on the front cover of this Appraisal shows the junction of The Street / South Street looking along the initial section of South Street. The Orchard, which is a small cul de sac of modern homes, is the only road accessing onto South Street.

3. South Street operates for the most part as a shared surface where vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists share the same road surface theoretically with mutual respect. The road is typical of the local village street character and is not untypical of the street character across the Cotswolds. It is subject to a 30mph speed limit though observed speeds are well below this level indicating its suitability for the promotion of a 20mph speed limit.

4. At the outset it should be stressed that there is not the available road width along South Street generally to create a continuous segregated footway. South Street's operation is clearly compromised during the traditional School drop off and pick up times for the main cohort at Uley Church of England Primary School (the School). This will be exacerbated by the proposed Nursery element subject to it being granted consent by the Council.

5 The Appraisal has been commissioned by the Parish Council in order to assess the operation of South Street generally, and how the potential impact of the two development proposals accessed off South Street would further impact upon it namely:

   i) The redevelopment of The Knoll, which is being promoted by Stroud District Council (the Council) and

   ii) The new nursery being promoted by the School.

6. This Appraisal does not purport to be a detailed critique of either of these development proposals. The Parish Council are proactively engaging with the Council on The Knoll redevelopment proposal in order to outline their concerns, and in the hope of influencing any future design of The Knoll to offset or mitigate any impact concerns.
7. A draft of this Appraisal had been submitted to the Parish Council for initial comments which largely related to points of clarification, and amplification. **Although this Appraisal has been commissioned by the Parish Council, this Appraisal is fully independent of the Parish Council.**

Documentation Considered

8. To inform this Appraisal, a number of detailed site visits have been undertaken including before and after the morning school run, and before and after the afternoon school pick up. Selected measurements of both road and footway widths have also been undertaken, and the observations have included the transient behaviour of parents / carers escorting children by foot to the school, and by vehicle.
9. Various technical documents have been provided by the Parish Council and have been considered to inform this Appraisal namely:
    i) Rappor's "*Technical Scoping Note*" (TSN) dated July 2025 which is a draft of a subsequent Transport Statement that may be submitted to the Council in respect of the Knoll redevelopment, and which contains useful technical information relating to traffic volumes and traffic speeds along South Street. That data being collected at a number of locations and on a number of occasions, and
    ii) Rappor's "*Stage 1 Road Safety Audit*" (RSA1) dated December 2025, and a further update to it dated March 2026 which details the road safety implications of the main access to The Knoll redevelopment alone. It does not purport to be an assessment of the implications of the redevelopment on the safety of South Street itself.
10. **In our opinion, whilst this Appraisal has considered this data prepared by others, and it would not have been logical not to, the Appraisal considers matters and issues outside of the scope of the documentation.**

Future Development Proposals

11. There are two future development proposals that may affect South Street namely an extension to the School which is the subject of a current planning application, and the redevelopment of The Knoll, which has been the subject of a series of pre-planning

application enquiries. These proposals are considered in subsequent paragraphs of this Appraisal with paragraphs 12 to 24 considering the School proposal, and paragraphs 25 to 29 considering The Knoll redevelopment proposal.

Uley Primary School Extension

12. The Council's planning application reference S.26/0498/FUL is for an extension to the School for the erection of a single storey bespoke nursery building. The proposal will increase the School roll from its existing 119 pupils to 149 pupils for which the additional 30 pupils would be the nursery child spaces. Given that it is highly likely that not all of the new spaces at the nursery will be siblings of current pupils attending the School that there will be significant additional movements including vehicles, and pedestrians on and along South Street.

13. It is understood that the current School roll for the academic year 2025/26 is 93 pupils, and as such any observations of existing movements currently associated with the School are of the order of a 22% lower than compared to the maximum capacity of the School, or a significant 58% less than will be the case assuming the Nursery is subsequently approved by the Council.

14. The planning application has been supported by a "*Design and Access Statement"* (DAS) prepared by Elevation One Building Design Limited. There has been no traffic data supplied in support of that planning application.

15. The planning application is currently not determined but there have been a number of comments received as detailed below. At the time of preparing this Appraisal, no detailed highways consultation response of the County Council had however been received.

16. To inform this Appraisal, it is appropriate to consider the consultation comments on the planning application received from various parties. The Parish Council's consultation comments on the planning application has indicated:

> *"No plans are given for access of 30 very young children plus staff for which this building is designed. Added to SDC's proposals for the adjoining Knoll site, with a proposed capacity of 63 people, UPC is extremely concerned about the safety of children and other pedestrians in this very constricted part of the village. The school currently has 93 on the roll and hopes to fill to its capacity of 119. There are, therefore, potentially a further 54 children, plus extra staff, plus 63 residents of The Knoll to fit into this area."*

17. It is assumed that the Parish Council will submit additional comments once and if additional information is submitted by the applicant. A thriving local School is a fundamental part of the local community, but the movement implications of such a proposal need to be carefully assessed.

18. **The School should in our opinion be encouraged as a minimum to evolve a Travel Plan to reduce unnecessary car use. The Travel Plan should encourage parents / carers to avoid indiscriminate or unthoughtful parking even if only of a short duration nature associated with drop off / pick up, and to assist in helping to encourage parents / carers to walk or cycle to the School as far as possible. This could be appropriately conditioned by the Council, but the impact of the potential increased number of pupils is of such magnitude, and concern that a Travel Plan should be submitted for consultation prior to the determination of the planning application in order to ensure that it would practically reduce traffic movements along South Street.**

19. There have been a number of third party comments on the planning application. A local resident along Woodstock Terrace is typical of several has commented:

> *"To reiterate the comments of others regarding road safety: Woodstock Terrace is not suitable, being too narrow, and having no footway or turning at the bottom, for additional motor traffic bringing children to and from the proposed nursery. Therefore the question of access, along with the traffic survey results, will need further consideration".*

20. It is clear that local residents of the wider village community clearly share the Parish Council's concerns in this regard. It is also understood following dialogue with the School that the School are keen to encourage parents / carers not to use this corridor either.

21. A response also indicated in conclusion of their response:

> *"We understand that there are also a couple of issues outstanding in this area.*
>
> *(1) Results of traffic surveys have not been made available.*
>
> *(2) The Parish Council have agreed on an independent Highway Impact Assessment."*

22. It is not clear what surveys this objector is referring to as no surveys have been provided in support of the School planning application. The independent highways impact assessment referred to by this objector is not this report.

23. **Plate A** shows a view of Woodstock Terrace looking to the south towards the School showing the lack of on street parking, and in the background the absence of any

suitable turning head. Woodstock Terrace is not suitable, if promoted as such, to be an appropriate location for any intensification in use. In reality, the most logical location to access the School including the proposal is off South Street subject to the caveats identified above.

24. **The location of the proposed extension is such that Woodstock Terrace is the more logical access corridor for temporary short term use by commercial vehicles associated with the construction activities at the School. The rationale for this element of advice being that Woodstock Terrace is considerably shorter than South Street with no 90 degree bends to negotiate, and can be more readily controlled by a banksman. The location of the proposed nursery is also within a short distance of the end of Woodstock Terrace. These details will need to be detailed in a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted for consultation prior to determination.**

Plate A: Woodstock Terrace Looking South Towards The School

Redevelopment of The Knoll

25. The Council's redevelopment of The Knoll has been the subject of extensive pre-planning application dialogue. The Council's proposal is for the comprehensive redevelopment of The Knoll involving the demolition of the eight existing timber framed dwellings, and their replacement by eighteen dwellings i.e: a net increase of ten properties on the site.

26. An illustrative drawing prepared by Quattro design architects shows that the parking for the greater proportion of the dwellings is located directly off the access roads with a reverse into or out of them. There are lengths of access road outside units 6 and 9 that do not have parking directly onto them, and this could be used by visitors to park along. The plans also show an area of 4 car parking spaces for the School's use. **There is no indication on the various plans whether these spaces are intended for staff use or for drop off / pick up purposes by parents / carers.**

27. The proposal itself is shown to be:

Unit Size	**Number of Units**	**Number of Occupants Per Unit**	**Total Occupantd**
1 bedroom	6	2	12
2 bedroom	5	4	20
3 bedroom	5	5	25
4 bedroom	2	6	12
Totals	18	69	69

28. There is an existing private car park for use by residents of The Knoll that is capable of accommodating up to 8 vehicles as shown on **plate B.** Despite the Knoll not being occupied, there were observed on the various site visits to inform this Appraisal to be a significant number of vehicles parked in the car park. **Consequently, it follows that once The Knoll is redeveloped, that those levels of off street parking activity in The Knoll's private car park will have to by necessity be relocated potentially to "*on street*" along South Street.**

29. During the course of the preparation of this Appraisal, all eight of the residential units at The Knoll were unoccupied and there were no house clearances, general site clearance or demolition occurring at the site. The traffic surveys undertaken by Rappor were carried out when some of the units were occupied. The only empirical data that details traffic flows locally, and is relatively up to date, is the TSN prepared by Rappor.

Plate B: The Knoll's Existing Car Park

Traffic Conditions Along South Street

30. The Rappor TSN is considered to be a precursor to the future TS, and usefully sets out traffic flows and speeds along South Street, which have been used to inform this Appraisal.

31. The surveys indicate the following:

    a) Paragraph 5.10 of the TSN indicates 85th percentile design speeds of northbound 15.0mph and southbound 14.7mph on the section of South Street between The Street and the bend at The Orchard,

    b) Paragraph 5.10 also indicates average speeds, and these are usually used to determine appropriate speed limits, and confirm for that section mean speeds of 11.8mph and 11.9mph northbound and southbound respectively, which means that a 20mph speed limit is wholly appropriate,

    c) Paragraph 5.6 confirms that some of the surveys were undertaken in school term times but guidance does not advise that such speeds collected during school holidays cannot be used, and whilst traffic flows may alter in school term to non school term times generally speeds are usually considered to be unaltered. The assessment of school term time data and school non term time data facilitates a comparison of the two to show the traffic flows due to the School,

f) Appendix D of the TSN contains traffic data for South Street north of The Orchard, and indicates School term time traffic flows as follows:

Day of Week	**N/b**	**S/b**	**Two Way**
Mo	234	236	470
Tu	243	243	486
We	264	367	531
Th	249	253	502
Fr	256	268	524
Mo	221	232	453
Tu	253	256	509
We	260	266	526
Th	250	256	506
Fr	268	267	535
Average Weekday	250	254	504
Highest Weekday	268	267	535

Where the weeks chosen are the weeks commencing Monday 3rd June 2024 and 10th June 2024. Appendix D to the TSN does not include any details of the hourly profiles of traffic. There were surveys also undertaken in School holiday periods of 30th May and Friday 1st June, and comparing these two days to the following weeks with School traffic included reveals the following:

Day	**N/b**	**S/b**	**Two Way**
Th Half Term	195	196	391
Th School Wk 1	249	253	502
Th School Wk 2	250	256	506
Difference Wk 1	**+54**	**+57**	**+111**
Difference Wk 2	**+55**	**+60**	**+115**
F Half Term	229	234	463
F School Wk 1	256	268	524
F School Wk 2	268	267	535
Difference Wk 1	**+27**	**+34**	**+61**
Difference Wk 2	**+39**	**+33**	**+72**

32. **The surveys do not reveal particularly high traffic levels nor particularly high vehicle speeds**.

33. The School's impact is of the order of 113 two way movements for a Thursday as the average of week 1 and week 2 values. Based on 93 pupils and using the difference between School term time, and non term time indicate that the difference attributable

to the School results in a vehicular trip rate of 1.22 vehicles per day per pupil or 0.61 vehicles per pupil in the a.m. peak journey to / from school and 0.61 vehicles per pupil in the p.m peak journey to / from school. In both cases the 0.61 value being two way. The impact of this is considered below.

Capacity of South Street

34. Guidance on the capacity of single track lanes is detailed in the TRL Research Working Paper TSN29R "*Studies of Delays to Traffic on Single-Lane Carriageways with Passing Places*" which summarily indicates that:

> *"simply in terms of their capacity for carrying moving traffic single-lane carriageways, correctly designed, are unlikely to incur significant increases in delay compared with traffic in free-flow conditions, at flow levels of up to 300 vph (total two-way)."*

35. The 300 vehicles per hour value from the TSN29R assumes intervisible passing places located at 60m intervals, and as this was a theoretical study that assumed that passing places were "*uniformly spaces along the length considered*". The passing places were also assumed as being 11m long with an additional 11m of taper in and taper out distances so 22m overall. It is not clear from TSN29R how the 300 vehicle per hour value has been derived from multiple assessments. What is evident is that all of the flows that were associated with the lowest delays were with 3 passing places per 180m or 60m apart with flows at 300vph being split as 250/50. However from table 7 when traffic flows are more evenly balanced that delays increase for the self evident reason that a greater balance of flows means more yielding to approaching vehicles. Indeed at flows of 100 v 100 delays increase by 21% with 3 passing places.

36. South Street is characterised at all times by parked cars which effectively restricts the road to single lane working with informal passing places largely at accesses to properties. Measured road widths at various locations along South Street without account of parked vehicles are detailed as follows:

Chainage	**Road Width**	**Narrative**
0m	n/a	"Give way" line onto The Street
5m	5.5m	Footway is 1.0m wide on east side but at a higher level than South Street
10.0m	4.0m	End of segregated footway
15.7m	3.55m	Notional footway level with South Street
15.7m to 34.1m	5.1m	Shared surface area

Chainage	Road Width	Narrative
38.2m to 67.2m	3.85m	Formal / segregated footway at 1.8m with roadway of 3.85m
67.2m to 107.2m	5.7m	1.7m footway on south side. Existing overhanging vegetation reduces effective footway width.
132.2m to 143.2m	5.2m/5.0m	No footway from #17 to #19/#6
153.2m	5.7m	Start of zig zag lines associated with the School
165.8m	4.8m / 5.0m	At fire hydrant but to south is wall to #14
177.5m	4.8m	Entry to The Knoll Private Parking
181.5m	4.8m	End of zig zag marking
189.0m	4.1m	
209.4m	3.9m	
229.4m	3.65m	
234.9m	3.4m	Start of widening in vicinity of Millenium Green

37. Figure 7.1 of Manual for Streets (MfS) *"illustrates all various carriageway widths can accommodate",* but caveated "*They are not necessarily recommendations":*
    i) A width of 5.5m allows two commercial vehicles to pass one another freely,
    ii) A width of 4.8m allows a commercial vehicle to pass a car,
    iii) A width of 4.4m allows a commercial vehicle to pass a cycle or two cars to pass one another, and
    iv) Widths below 4.1m only allow single passage of vehicles only.
38. The assessment of the widths indicating that generally the width allows for two cars to freely pass, and for cars to pass for example refuse vehicles. However, the presence of parked car means that the road only operates practically as single track with very limited passing places largely at accesses, and no formal defined passing places.
39. Turning back to TSN29R and using the lowest level of passing place then even at 50 v 50 vehicles two way delays are 26% greater than 250 v 50.

Impact of Increased Traffic Flows

40. The impact of the two proposals needs to be assessed. The assessment process is to consider existing traffic flows, and then to adjust and then to add on the various proposals:

a) The existing hourly traffic flows are not known as the TSN has not presented hourly flows, but for the assessment the traffic flows without the school are assumed at 10% of total daily as follows:

A.M. Peak			**P.M. Peak**		
N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
20	20	40	20	20	40

b) The values above need to have the existing school flows added back in of:

A.M. Peak			**P.M. Peak**		
N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
+28	+28	+56	0	0	0

Where it is assumed that there are no school related movements during the network evening peak hour.

c) The base traffic flows of the extant consents at The Knoll plus the School defined as (a) plus (b) above are:

A.M. Peak			**P.M. Peak**		
N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
48	48	96	20	20	40

d) The impact of the School's extension plus full occupation of the school applies to the a.m. peak only, and is assessed as 56 x 0.305 for arrivals in the a.m. peak, and similarly as departures in the a.m. peak.

A.M. Peak			**P.M. Peak**		
N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
+17	+17	+34	0	0	0

e) The Knoll is assessed as having 6-8 departures / arrivals per unit, and in addition it is not unreasonable to assess the 1 bed units as being half of those values due to the limited number of occupants so the proposed Knoll redevelopment is equivalent to 15 houses or a net 7 dwellings increase over the extant consent so The Knoll redevelopment could add values of:

A.M. Peak			**P.M. Peak**		
N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
+4	+2	+6	+2	+4	+6

f) The combined effect of the Nursery plus The Knoll redevelopment could result in total flows defined as (c) plus (d) and (e) of:

A.M. Peak			**P.M. Peak**		
N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
69	67	136	22	24	46

41. For assessment of vehicular impact, the values that matter are the difference between the values at (f) compared to (c) which indicates:

	A.M. Peak			P.M. Peak		
	N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
Base	48	48	96	20	20	40
Proposed	69	67	136	22	24	46
Difference	+21	+19	+40	+2	+4	+6

Impact of Increased Movements

42. The values above are vehicles only. There are no existing surveys of the levels of non-vehicular movements on South Street. The assessment of the School's existing traffic generation was detailed at (b) in paragraph 43 which indicates a potential 28 cars dropping off, and picking up for the 93 pupils. It is understood that the percentage of siblings is of the order of 20%, so the 28 vehicles could relate to 28 x 1.2 pupils or 34 pupils, and the remainder 59 existing pupils will be by foot or possibly cycle in 49 groups of adults escorting a child or two. As such, assuming that pedestrians are of the order of 10% of traffic flows excluding the School element then the values at a) to f) need to be assessed for pedestrian movements as follows:

	A.M. Peak			P.M. Peak		
	N/b	**S/b**	**T/w**	**N/b**	**S/b**	**T/w**
Existing	2	2	4	2	2	4
School	+49	+49	+98	0	0	0
Base	51	51	102	2	2	4
Nursery	+47	+47	+64	0	0	0
The Knoll	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+2
Totals	99	99	198	3	3	6

Where the nursery values include the underoccupancy of +26 pupils added to 30 nursery pupils resulting in a 56 pupil increase with a 20% sibling factor resulting in 47 groups additional.

43. In order to assess the impact on South Street, the levels of movements for vehicles and non vehicles combined count as these are the impediments to travel:

	A.M. Peak				P.M. Peak			
	N/b		S/b		N/b		S/b	
	Vehs	N/v	Vehs	N/v	Vehs	N/v	Vehs	N/v
Base	48	51	48	51	20	2	20	2
Proposed	69	99	67	99	22	3	24	3
Impact	+21	+48	+19	+48	+2	+1	+4	+1

44. The potential increased traffic flows and movements of pedestrians and cyclists as a result of the proposals accessed off South Street could detrimentally impact on the operation and safety of the School. The two proposals, as such, will increase movements on South Street and through the junction of The Street with South Street. **Movements on South Street could increase from 198 two way in the a.m peak hour as base flows to 335 two way with the proposal. This is hence above the TSN29R values where delays are higher than two way roads.**

Plate C: South Street Outside of School Drop Off / Pick Up with Limited Passing Opportunities

Ability of South Street to Accommodate Additional Development

45. The theoretical levels are one element of the ability of South Street to accommodate additional development. **Plate C** shows South Street outside of school drop off / pick up time with very limited passing opportunities. **Plate D** shows South Street with The Knoll on the left at similar times to **plate C**. **Plates E and F** show the forward visibility

that is rather foreshortened along South Street along the School's frontage. **Plates G to J** show the competing demands for road space use during School drop off and pick up even without The Knoll occupied and the School below capacity. This situation given the values above will only be likely to significantly worsen.

46. **It is our opinion that the nursery flows plus the greater occupancy of the school together with The Knoll redevelopment will exacerbate the existing issues along South Street, and that mitigation should be sought.**

Pedestrian Facilities

47. **It is not possible to walk from one end to the other end along South Street on a footway as there are significant discontinuities as detailed previously. It is not possible to walk on a footpath to the School along South Street. The lack of a continuous footway means that pedestrians need to walk in the carriageway over the greater proportion of South Street. This means that parents / carers escorting a child to School turning into South Street from The Street have to undertake multiple crossings of South Street which add to the overall journey time, and have to walk for the greater part on street.**

Plate D: South Street Looking South in the Vicinity of The Knoll

Plate E: South Street Looking North Towards School Frontage

Plate F: South Street Looking South Along School Frontage

Plate G: South Street Along School Frontage

Plate H: South Street During School Drop Off

Plate I: South Street in Vicinity of The Knoll During School Pick Up

Plate J: South Street During School Drop Off

Plate K: Visibility Looking Left

The Street / South Street Junction

48. **Plates K and L** show the visibility splays looking left and right from a 2.4m set back respectively, and the levels of visibility are severely impacted upon by parked cars. Vehicles have been observed departing from South Street to poke out or protrude into the running carriageway of The Street in order to increase the levels of visibility effectively achieved.

49. **Plate M** shows The Street northbound footway terminating at South Street showing wholly inadequate pedestrian to vehicle intervisibility. Pedestrians walking on the south side of The Street, or turning into South Street have very foreshortened visibility. As shown on **plates L and M** there is a raised footway on the north side of South Street at this point.

50. **Plates N and O** show that the existing "*Keep Clear*" markings but these are applied along The Street and do not prevent "*blocking back*" interfering with the free flow of vehicles along South Street. **Plate P** shows that free flow past The Street / South Street junction is also impacted by local public transport operations.

Plate L: Visibility Looking Right

Plate M: The Street Footpath Terminating at South Street

Plate N: Keep Clear Markings

Plate O: Keep Clear Markings on South Street Looking South

Plate P: Public Transport Affecting Free Flow Past The Street / South Street Junction

Mitigation Measures

51. **The concern of the Parish Council regarding the practical capacity of South Street is in our opinion well founded. There is no obvious potential to meaningfully improve South Street to create a continuous footway through to The Knoll and the School, or indeed beyond. The Parish Council are being, in our opinion, very proactive in encouraging both developments but want to ensure that the safety of all users both existing and in the future are not compromised. Mitigation should be sought from both the School, and the Council as the developer for The Knoll. This mitigation would pass the tests of planning gain being fully and appropriately related to both development proposals.**

52. **In our opinion, the following as a minimum should be considered:**

    i) The creation of build outs where no footway exists so that pedestrians can step aside to allow vehicles to pass through is improving their safety and highway safety generally,

    ii) The installation of areas of cobbling or other sympathetic surface treatment at selected intervals along South Street to reinforce the shared nature of the lane, and to calm traffic speeds. The location of any such

measures will need careful consideration to ensure that the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties is not impacted upon,

iii) The refreshing of existing "*School Keep Clear*" road marking on the highway surface that are indistinct,

iv) A raised plateau along The School frontage which will force vehicles to slow down to negotiate but will clearly identify the need to be aware of other users,

v) The investigation of the creation of additional off-street parking areas to cater for the existing demand at the existing The Knoll private car park which will be "*lost*" once The Knoll is redeveloped which would otherwise have to relocate to on street. However, it is highly unlikely that appropriate off street locations for this will be found,

vi) The creation of a "yellow box" on the approach to The Street junction to allow incoming vehicles to more freely pass without blocking back which should be from chainage 10m to 15.7m where South Street's existing road which at this critical point does now allow two way simultaneous passage of cars,

vii) The removal of a short length of on street parking either side of The Street / South Street junction to improve the levels of the achieved visibility splays or a remarking of The Street's edge of carriageway markings on the south side or the creation of a widened area of build out (to increase that shown on plate K) combined with a repositioning / realignment of the "*give way*" line, and

viii) Both planning applications should require prior to determination the submission of robust construction traffic management plans. For both proposals, deliveries should only occur after School drop off and prior to School pick up in order to avoid conflict between heavy commercial vehicles, and pedestrians. In this regard a timing restriction of 09.30 to 14.30 would be appropriate and should be applied. In addition, given the tortuous nature of South Street at The Vestry, and outside the School, applicants should demonstrate that all expected vehicles associated with demolition, site clearance, and deliveries of construction material can manoeuvre along South Street from The Street to the applicable application site including the situation with parked cars along South Street. It is highly likely that a size restriction will also need to be applied which would be for the applicant to define.

Summary and Conclusions

53. **The presence of significant lengths where simultaneous passing by vehicles of others is not possible delays and conflicts are inevitably introduced, and will be worsened by full occupation of The School, and the Nursery application, and the redevelopment of The Knoll.**

54. **There is no obvious potential to meaningfully improve South Street to create a continuous footway through to The Knoll and the School, or indeed beyond. The best that can be achieved is appropriate, and proportionate mitigation. Mitigation should be sought from both the School, and the Council as the developer for The Knoll. This mitigation would pass the tests of planning gain being fully and appropriately related to both development proposals.**