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## Qualifications and Experience

1. My name is Stephen Heathc ote. I have a BA (Hons) degree in Architecture, and Post-Graduate Diplomas in Architecture and in Town Planning. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and of the Royal Institute of British Architects. I am a member of the Urban Design Group, a nd have been employed in local govemment as a ssista nt chief officer responsible for urban design and landscape. Since 1998 I have been principal of the practice of Bakewell \& Partners, an architectural and town planning practice based in Belper, Derbyshire.

## Background

2. The Representors, Mr and Mrs Brooks, own a parcel of land off Barker Hill in Lowdham which they have proposed for housing development through the Strategic Housing Land Assessment (site 08_0280) and in the Local Development Framework (site X2(Lo)).
3. The site appears ideally located to meet a clearlocal need for housing in Lowdham. Spatial Policy 2 of the Core Strategy adopted in March 2011 requires sites for 65 new housesto be identified in Lowdham. The Representors' site could provide about 25 of these houses. Discussions have been taking place with Midlands Rural Housing on the basisthat at least 9 of these ( $36 \%+$ ) would be transferred as social housing to meet part of the identified local need (see extracts of correspondence attached at Appendix 1).
4. The site has been included in the Susta ina bility Appraisal Report (Doc ument ADM6), where it sc ores at least as highly as a ny other site in Lowdham. The alloc ation of the site was supported in the Green Belt Study (Document EB22), and has potential benefits in improving the landscape setting of the village and improving access to the public rights of way network for existing residents. The site is not subject to flooding, and has potential to incorporate Susta inable Urban Drainage systems (SUDS) to prevent inc reased risk of flooding elsewhere.
5. It is understood that these benefits of a llocating the site, set out in previous submissions, are agreed by the Council, and they are not repeated in this Statement. The sole reason for not including the site in the Publication DPD is understood to be an objection on highway grounds from the highway a uthority, Nottingha mshire County Council (NCC). This Statement provides additional evidence addressing the highways concem.

## Highways issues

6. The Representors have commissioned independent transport planning consultants, PTB Transport Planning Ltd, to advise on the highways objection. Detailed observationsand surveys have been undertaken at the site a nd the transport conc lusions are presented in the PTB Transport Statement that a c companies this Sta tement at Appendix 2. PTB's report was e-mailed to NCC for comments on 21 November2012. A summary of the findings of the report is provided here.
7. The highways objection is based on a local policy. NCC indic ate that they are objecting to the proposal to add a further 25 dwellings off a cul-de-sac system that already serves a total of 150 dwellings. The Representors have sought to enter into disc ussions with other landowners to provide altemative access to the site but these discussions have ultimately proved fruitless.
8. Traffic and parking surveys were undertaken in the residential estate of which Barker Hill is part on $6^{\text {th }}$ November 2012. These traffic surveys consisted of a traffic count at the start of the cul-de-sac system and a parking beat survey conducted along the route to the site.
9. The traffic survey indicated that traffic levels on Main Street in Lowdham are relatively modest, and no queues and delays were observed at the junction of Ma in Street with Francklin Road (the entrance to the 150 dwellings). Indeed, traffic levels on Francklin Road are below those one might generally expect foran average 150 dwelling development even with the inclusion of traffic associated with the doctor's surgery located on Francklin Road. Part of the reason forthe modest traffic generation of the 150 dwellings in the development is undoubtedly due to the fact that $25-30$ of these dwellings are small bungalow sheltered housing dwellings and not all of the elderly residents of these dwellings have access to a private carand most will not have a necessity to tra vel in the highway peak hours.
10. PTB also considered how existing parking levels on-street might affect the twoway operation of the highway network en route to the proposal site. The parking beat surveys covered Francklin Road as faras Barker Hill, and Barker Hill asfar as the boundary with the proposal site.
11. The highest levels of parking on this route were to be found on Francklin Road closest to the doctor'ssurgery, which is on the comer of Francklin Road and Main Street. In the moming parking numbers build on this section after the surgery hours begin. A maximum level of parking was observed at ten vehicles on this section of Francklin Road in the moming period of survey with an average of just over five in this period. Observations in this period indicated very little delay to traffic using this section of Francklin Road as a result of the parking. In the late aftemoon survey period parking levels were a steady eight to ten vehic lesfrom 16:00 hours falling away to about five vehicles by 17:15 onwards. The average parking level was 7.5 vehicles in any 15 minute period at this time. Any delays to the two-way movement of vehiclescaused by the parking, amounted to no more than a few seconds and the majority of vehicles passed unhindered in any way. Throughout the period no parking was observed on the north side of Francklin Road and parking levels of the remainder of the route to the site were minimal and caused no delay to traffic.
12. There are three further parking a reas of interest in this location; the doctor's surgery car park holds six vehic les for staff and disabled use only, adjacent to this a nd the sheltered housing is a carpark that holds about seven vehicles, and opposite is a free-to-use council run carpark which hascapacity for a pproximately 30 vehicles. The doctor's surgery carpark was constantly full and the adjacent carpark typic ally held five to seven vehicles. However, the free-to-use carpark is under-utilised with typic ally only three to five vehicles observed using this carpark. Clearly then, there is sufficient off-street parking
available on this section of Francklin Road to cater for existing on-street parking levels.
13. The level of traffic associated with 25 dwellings is a maximum of 15-17 twoway traffic movements in any peak hour on the highway network. On-site observations indicate that the Main Street/Francklin Road prionity junction has more than ample capacity to cater for this minimal increase in traffic (one vehicle every 3.5 to 4.0 minutes).
14. Neither will an additional vehicle every 3.5 to 4.0 minutescause any noticeable change to the minimal levels of delay to vehicles passing along Francklin Road on the section of road closest to the doctor's surgery. Indeed, as residential development, the traffic will have the same tidal flow characteristics as the existing residential development (predominantly out in the moming and in during the late aftemoon) which further reduces any potential conflict and impact on delay to existing users of the road.
15. NCC's own guidance on the 150 dwelling limit off a single point of access recognises that it is not applic able in all instances and each site should be considered on its own merits. It is clear that, in this instance, the access roads can comfortably cope with the additional traffic associated with 25 dwellings and will not cause any additional delay to general traffic or emergency traffic accessing the site.
16. Indeed, guidance from Manual for Streets (MfS) (Department for Transport, 2007) is not presc riptive on the numbers of dwellings served off a single access and indic ates only that it is important to caterfor the needs of emergency services, the fire service in partic ular. This development proposal would simply add a short section of highway to the road network of the estate and will not impact upon the minimal levels of delay suffered by vehicle drivers within the estate. Indeed, MfS indic ates that the importance of motor vehicle movement within residential areas is low. It is a lso interesting that even with the addition of traffic associated with the proposed development the levels of traffic predicted on Francklin Road would be at or below those acceptable in a Home Zone type layout with shared vehic le/pedestrian surfaces for movement.
17. The proposal site is located in close proximity to Lowdham Village with its shops, post office, and food and leisure facilities. It is also well served by buses, both in the village and close to the railway station, and it is also clearly well placed to take advantage of the train services at the station.
18. Even though this development proposal will not result in any notic eable transport harm it is proposed to undertake the following measures to further enhance movement and safety. The new houses will include sprinkler systems to enhance the fire safety credentials of the development. It is proposed that two or three disabled bays will be marked out on street close to the doctor's surgery. This gives the opportunity for NCC to double yellow line Francklin Road from Main Street as faras the free-to-use carpark which will encourage its use without disadvantaging less able car users. It is further proposed that the development offers to improve the surfacing and lighting of the Neighbours La ne footpath adjacent to the site and to provide links to it that will provide a direct and convenient walk link from the proposal site, and other dwellings on Barker Hill, into the heart of the village.
19. Finally, the guidance in NPPF (Doc ument ND10) on transport is clear, if a development proposal cannot be demonstrated to cause severe transport harm, it should be allowed (para. 32).
20. In summary:

- Existing traffic flows in the development are lowerthan a verage,
- Minimal delay is caused to traffic by existing parking,
- There will be no noticeable traffic impact related to development traffic,
- NCC's own policy indicatesthat the level of development served by a single access needsto be assessed on a site-by-site basis,
- Greater than 150 dwellings off a single access can easily be MfS compliant,
- The proposal site is well located to local facilities a nd services a nd very well served by public transport, both busand rail. It also makes use of existing road infrastructure that is more than suitable and therefore must be considered a sustainable location for development.
- The proposal site will provide; fire safety measures, disabled car parking baysclose to the doctor'ssurgery, and improve the footpath link to the village centre, a nd
- The development will not cause severe transport harm (far from it) a nd is therefore fully supported by national policy set out in NPPF.


## Conclusion

21. The Public ation DPD fa ils to a llocate suffic ient housing sites in Lowdha $m$ to meet a clear and demonstrable local need in the Nottingham Fringe a rea and is therefore inconsistent with the adopted Core Strategy. The Representors' site X2 is eminently suitable for housing development to meet this need, meeting all rea sonable susta inability, la ndsc ape, G reen Belt and transport criteria. It should therefore be alloc ated for housing development in the DPD.

## APPENDIX 1

1. Initial letter from Midlands Rural Housing, 6 A pril 2010
2. Latest e-mail from Midlands Rural Housing, 6 November 2012

Mr Charles and Mrs Angela Brooks
Emberton Cottage
Badwell Ash
Bury St. Edmunds
Suffolk
IP31 3DH
$6^{\text {th }}$ April 2010
Dear Mr \& Mrs Brooks

## Re: Land East of Main Street, Lowd ham, Notts.

Midlands Rural Housing is working in partnership with Newark \& Sherwood District Council and Nottingham Community Housing Association to provide a development of affordable housing for local people n Lowdham.

We are currently seeking a suitable sitg on which to develop the housing which is acceptable to planners, local residents and the parish council, while also being outside the flood plain and green belt restrictions. You are the reyistered owners of an area of agricultural land to the east of Main Stjeet, with access a a ailable from Barker Hill, which we would be interested in considering for such a development.

We are seeking to develop up to 18 affordable properties and would require in the region of 2 acres of land. The site lies putside the village boundary and is currently restricted to agricultural use. It would not normally be el gible for development purposes. However, it would be treated as an 'exception site', meaning that planners can make an exception to the normal planning regulations for the purposes of developing affordable housing. This dфes not make the lind eligible for open market housing develypment. Nottingham Conmunity Housing Association would be responsible for purchasing the land at exception site' va ue and they are able to offer in the region of $£ 8,000-£ 10,000$ per housing plot.

I would be very interested in discussing this proposal with you and would be grateful if you would contact me via our Crom ord office, on my direct line 01629827007 , or by email at milesking@midlandsrh.or uk.

Whitwick Business Centre
www.midland ${ }^{\text {ruralhousing.ora.uk }}$
Email:: midlandsrlural@midlandsrh org.uk

## Stephen Heathcote

From: Miles King [MilesKing@midlandsrh.org.uk]
Sent: 06 November 2012 09:46
To: Stephen Heathcote
Subject: RE: Barker Hill, Lowdham
Hello Stephen

Nice to hear from you again. All is well thanks, although a little quiet at the moment. Most Local Authorities are concentrating on submitting their Core Strategies or amending their Exception Site policies and most RPs are trying to conjure up new methods of funding developments, so in the meantime, there is not a lot going on.

It's good to hear that you are still pursuing the Barker Hill site. Yes, we still have a need for affordable housing in Lowdham. The need identified in the last housing needs study has never been satisfied. There was also a HNS carried out in the neighbouring parish of Gunthorpe in 2009 which identified a need for 9 dwellings. We were never able to identify a site there as, like Lowdham, it almost all falls into floodplain. There is therefore a strong argument for affordable housing to be located on a suitable site in Lowdham.

Good luck. Keep me informed on progress.
Regards

Miles

Miles King
Trent Valley Partnership Project Officer
Midlands Rural Housing
Tel: 01629827007
Mob: 07768708364

From: Stephen Heathcote [mailto:Stephen@bakewell-and-partners.co.uk]
Sent: 05 November 2012 16:24
To: Miles King
Subject: Barker Hill, Lowdham
Hello Miles
Not been in touch for a while - hope things are well with you.
We a re still pushing for the allocation of the land at Barker Hill for housing in the Newark \& Sherwood local plan, a nd are intending to challenge the highways issues at the Examination in Public next month. My understanding is that it is only the highway objection which has prevented the site being allocated in the deposit draft - the landscape and Green Belt assessments published by the council seem favourable. We will a rgue that the Core Strategy requires local need in the "Nottingham Fringe" area to be met in Lowdham, a nd that the site access is acceptable (notwithstanding the highwa y a uthority's comments). Without this allocation, the Allocations DPD is not consistent with the adopted Core Strategy.
Can you confirm that you still have a requirement for social housing in Lowdham?

## Best regards

Stephen

## APPENDIX 2

PTB Tra nsport Sta tement

## Bakewell \& Partners

Land off Barker Hill<br>Lowdham<br>Transport Statement

PTB Transport Planning Ltd Suite H1 Radclyffe House 66/68 Hagley Road Edgbaston
Birmingham
West Midlands
B16 8PF
T/F. 01214545530
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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

1.1.1 PTB Transport Planning Ltd has been commissioned by Bakewell and Partners, on behalf of Mr and Mrs CWO Brooks, to provide transport advice for a proposed residential development off Barker Hill, Lowdham.
1.1.2 It is intended that the site will provide 25 dwellings; the site location is shown on Figure 1.1 and the proposal land is indicated in Appendix A

### 1.2 Purpose and Structure of the Report

1.2.1 This report is intended to provide consideration of the highway and transport issues related to this proposed residential development and to promote the site as part of the Local Plan process. This report will pay particular regard to the response of the highway authority during the consultation process for the LDF.

- Chapter 2 - Background Information;
- Chapter 3 - Traffic Generation and Impact;
- Chapter 4 - Sustainability Audit,
- Chapter 5 - Highway Safety;
- Chapter 6 - Policy Considerations;
- Chapter 7 - Mitigation Measures;
- Chapter 8 - Summary and Conclusion.


### 1.3 Limitations of this report

1.3.1 This report has been undertaken at the request of Bakewell \& Partners on behalf of Mr \& Mrs CWO Brooks, thus should not be entrusted to any third party without written permission from PTB Transport Planning Ltd. However, should any information contained within this report be used by any unauthorised third party, it is done so entirely at their own risk and shall not be the responsibility of PTB Transport Planning Ltd.
1.3.2 This report has been compiled using data from a number of external sources (such as TRICS and traffic count data); whilst these sources are considered to be trustworthy, PTB Transport Planning Ltd is not responsible for the accuracy of the data provided.

### 2.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 2.1 Planning Background

2.1.1 The site is being promoted for inclusion in the Local Plan for Newark \& Sherwood District Council. It is supported on planning and landscape grounds but is currently being blocked by Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) on highway grounds.

### 2.2 Highway Objections

2.2.1 The highways objection is based on a local policy. NCC indicates that they are objecting to the proposal to add a further 25 dwellings off a cul-de-sac system that already serves a total of 150 dwellings.
2.2.2 They indicate that their policy only allows a total of 150 dwellings off such an access. We shall return to this policy consideration later in this report.
2.2.3 The applicant entered into discussions with other landowners to seek alternative access to the site via another link into the cul-de-sac system but, ultimately, this line of enquiry was blocked by an intervening landowner.

### 2.3 Traffic and Parking Surveys

2.3.1 In order to assist in the consideration of the likely traffic impact of the proposed development PTB undertook traffic turning count and parking surveys in the vicinity of the site on Tuesday $6^{\text {th }}$ November 2012.
2.3.2 A turning count survey was undertaken at the junction of Main Street and Francklin Road, the entrance to the cul-de-sac system. This traffic count is summarised in Figure 2.1 for the morning and afternoon peak hours.
2.3.3 The parking survey was a beat survey undertaken every 15 minutes between 07:30-09:30 and 16:00-18:00 and is summarised in Appendix B.

### 3.0 TRAFFIC GENERATION AND IMPACT

### 3.1 Traffic Assessments

3.1.1 Based on the guidance in the DfT document "Guidance on Transport Assessment", a site of the scale of that proposed, 25 dwellings, does not generally warrant a Transport Statement (TS) let alone the fuller consideration of a Transport Assessment (TA). The threshold set for a TS is greater than 50 units.
3.1.2 Nevertheless, given the current view of the highway authority we feel it may be useful to demonstrate the potential scale of impact of 25 dwellings on the highway network.

### 3.2 TRICS

3.2.1 The TRICS program provides a database of developments and associated traffic generation nationally and is an industry recognised standard for the calculation of development trip rates.
3.2.2 In line with guidance we have selected a number of sites with similar profiles to that of the Lowdham development proposal. Of the 24 surveys available within the acceptable data range 12 were discounted as previous surveys of re-surveyed sites or because they had trip rates profiles inconsistent with those generally observed.
3.2.3 The mean and median values of the forecast peak hour trip rates are very close with little variance between the two. The TRICS traffic generation output is included as Appendix C to this report.

### 3.3 Traffic Generation

3.3.1 Table 1 below summarises the predicted trip rates and the forecast trip generation for the development proposal site.

Table 1 - Trip Rates and Forecast Trip Generation

| Peak Period | Trip Rate (per unit) |  | Trips |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In | Out | In | Out |  |
| AM 0800-0900 | 0.151 | 0.434 | 4 | 11 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| PM 1630-1730 | 0.456 | 0.236 | 11 | 6 | $\mathbf{1 7}$ |

3.3.2 By any measure the predicted traffic generation of the site at peak times on the highway network is minimal at one vehicle movement every three and a half to four minutes.

### 3.4 Traffic Impact

3.4.1 The junction of Francklin Road with Main Street currently carries 221 vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 207 movements in the afternoon peak hour. The traffic impact of the proposed development is $6.8 \%$ in the AM peak hour and $8.2 \%$ in the PM peak hour, against a background of extremely low traffic flows.

### 3.5 Traffic Generation of the Existing 150 Dwelling Development

3.5.1 In the AM peak hour there were a total of 40 movements from the existing estate and 28 into the estate. In the PM peak hour there were 33 departures and 50 arrivals.
3.5.2 These traffic movements included a considerable number of movements to/from the doctor's surgery located close to the Main Street junction, particularly in the evening peak hour. Even if these traffic movements are included the two-way trip rate calculated for the 150 dwellings is only some 0.45 trips per dwelling in the morning peak hour and 0.55 per dwelling in the evening peak hour.
3.5.3 The trip rate forecasts utilised for the additional 25 dwellings are therefore robust when compared to the observed trip rates for the existing estate.

### 3.6 Traffic Flows on Francklin Road

3.6.1 As noted above, in the AM peak hour, a two-way traffic movement of 68 was observed on Francklin Road, in the PM peak hour the two-way traffic movement was 83 vehicles.
3.6.2 By any standards such a level of traffic movement is low on even residential roads. The addition of traffic associated with the proposed development is predicted to increase the level of traffic to 83 two-way movements in the AM peak hour and 100 two-way movements in the PM peak hour.
3.6.3 Again such levels of traffic are low for residential estates, to the extent that such a level of traffic movement is likely to be considered acceptable for a Home Zone type layout in modern residential estates, with pedestrians and vehicles sharing the highway for movement and other activities.

### 3.7 Parking Impact

3.7.1 During surveys on-site it was observed that the majority of parking along Francklin Road is associated with the use of the doctor's surgery close to the junction of Francklin Road with Main Street.
3.7.2 The doctor's surgery has a small car park directly in front of the building for six vehicles that appeared to be constantly full in the late afternoon survey period and full from about 8AM during the morning survey period. Just to the east and adjacent to the surgery is another parking area adjacent to
smaller flat/bungalows (approximately 25-30). It is understood that the car park does belong to the surgery but is also used by the residents of these small bungalows. The car park holds about seven vehicles and five to seven vehicles were parked during both survey periods.
3.7.3 Opposite this car park is a free to use council run car park with space for up to 30 vehicles. Typically this car park was used by three to five vehicles during the survey period with a maximum of eight vehicles parked during a single 15 -minute period in the evening peak.
3.7.4 Parking on Francklin Road itself was exclusively on the south side of the road during the morning survey period. The level of parking at the start of the survey period (07:30) was two vehicles. By 08:30 five vehicles were parked at this location and by 09:30 the number parked was ten vehicles. The vehicles at the western end of the road were observed to be exclusively associated with the doctor's surgery. Indeed many parked at the northern end were also associated with the surgery.
3.7.5 In the PM survey period parking on Francklin Road itself was also exclusively on the south side of the road. At 16:00 nine vehicles were parked on the road, by 17:00 eight vehicles were parked and by 17:30 five vehicles were parked on the road; the same number being parked at 18:00.
3.7.6 Clearly, sufficient free off-street parking exists in close proximity to the doctor's surgery, with typically 15 or so spaces free in the council run car park. However, users of the surgery choose not to use the car park to any great extent.
3.7.7 Francklin Road measures 5.5 m wide. It has footways of $1.8 \mathrm{~m}-1.9 \mathrm{~m}$ either side of the carriageway with $1.6 \mathrm{~m}-1.7 \mathrm{~m}$ grass verges. The section of Francklin Road perpendicular to Main Street with the doctor's surgery on it is about 130 m long. Allowing for driveways and proximity to junctions this might take a total level of parking, on the southern side of the road, of 16 vehicles.
3.7.8 The impact of the parking on this section of road was observed to be very minor. On occasions vehicles pulled into gaps in the parking to let others pass and any delays were only for a few seconds. Indeed, the observed level of traffic flow is so low that vehicles travelling in opposite directions only met on this section of road infrequently.
3.7.9 The addition of 25 dwellings with associated traffic generation of 15 vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 17 vehicle movements in the PM peak hour, and with the same tidal flow characteristics as the existing residential development will not have a noticeable impact on the minor delays experienced by motorists in this location.
3.7.10 On the remainder of the route to the proposed housing parking levels are extremely low and no delays whatsoever were observed to traffic movements as a result of parking or otherwise.

### 4.0 SUSTAINABILITY AUDIT

### 4.1 Local Facilities

4.1.1 The centre of Lowdham and its facilities is within relatively close proximity of the proposed development site. The following facilities are provided on either Main Street or Francklin Road;

- Doctor's surgery,
- Library,
- Post office and store,
- Co-op store,
- Bookshop,
- Public house offering bed \& breakfast,
- Pharmacy,
- Several restaurants (take-out and sit-in),
- Primary school,
- Nursery,
- Chapel,
- Home furnishing store.
4.1.2 The range of services provided include many of those that might be expected to be used by residents on a day-to-day basis.


### 4.2 Sustainable Travel Options

Walk
4.2.1 Footways will be provided within the development providing a safe means for pedestrians to access the wider footway network to Lowdham.
4.2.2 In addition, footpath connections will be provided to the existing Neighbours Lane FP no. 8 giving direct access to the heart of the village.

Cycle
4.2.3 There are two traffic-free sections of cycle route on the A6097 south of the A612 and on the A612 east of the A6097. However, of more importance, is the fact that the bypass itself ensures that the routes through the village are lightly trafficked and safe to use for cyclists.

## Bus

4.2.4 Lowdham is well served by buses. Service number 3 runs to Southwell three times per day and Averham once daily. It also runs to Southwell
(Minster School). Service number 26 runs between Nottingham and Southwell via Lowdham and runs every 20 minutes during the day.
4.2.5 Closer to the railway station service numbers $5,100, \mathrm{~S} 9, \mathrm{~N} 12$ and 612 can be accessed. The latter two services give access to Frank Seeley School in Calverton. Service 100 runs between Southwell and Nottingham and runs every 20 minutes. Service number 5 runs hourly between Oxton and Nottingham.

Rail
4.2.6 Lowdham railway station provides a service linking Leicester and Lincoln on an hourly basis including stops at East Midlands Parkway, Beeston, Nottingham and Newark on an hourly basis.

### 4.3 Conclusion

4.3.1 Although a relatively small settlement Lowdham has a range of facilities that are likely to be used by residents on a day-to-day basis. It has shops, a post office, medical facilities, leisure and eating outlets.
4.3.2 Lowdham is very well served by public transport giving its residents opportunities to travel further afield for employment opportunities and for secondary education.

### 5.0 HIGHWAY SAFETY

### 5.1 Accident Data

5.1.1 Accident data was provided by NCC for the latest five-year period available; the data provided was for the period $01 / 01 / 07$ to $31 / 08 / 12$. The data is included as Appendix $D$ to this report.
5.1.2 No personal injury accidents (PIAs) were recorded at the Main Street/Francklin Road junction. Neither were there any accidents within the rest of the estate served off Francklin Road.
5.1.3 Only two PIAs were recorded on Main Street through the village in this period; one a slight accident and the other a serious accident.
5.1.4 Although all PIAs are regrettable the volume of accidents observed in the village is relatively low and no accidents have been recorded in the estate itself or at the Main Street/Francklin Road junction; therefore there is no existing safety issue on the access roads to the site.

### 6.0 POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1 Nottinghamshire County Council Residential Design Guide

6.1.1 Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has objected to the inclusion of this site in the Development Plan Document (DPD) on the basis that;
"the limit on development served by a single point of access has already been reached"
6.1.2 There are 150 dwellings served by the existing cul-de-sac system that would form the access to the proposed development site. However, the Design Guide itself (paragraph 3.13) defines the limit as;
"normally no more than 150",
with a footnote indicating that exceptions may be considered on a site-bysite basis.
6.1.3 The principal rationale for a limit on cul-de-sac size is to ensure access for the emergency services, particularly the fire service. The fire service adopts a risk-based approach to assessing whether any proposed housing layout is acceptable. In this instance we have demonstrated that delays in reaching the proposed site are, and would remain, minimal. It is also true that enhanced fire protection measures could be included in the new homes, such as sprinkler systems, should they be required where additional access time is envisaged.
6.1.4 The threshold of 150 dwellings takes no account of dwelling size or demographics. There are some 25-30 smaller sheltered housing units at St. Mary's Close. A considerable number of the residents of these dwellings will not have access to a car and will not impact on highway congestion. The traffic surveys undertaken support this argument, with the peak hour traffic generation of the housing served by Francklin Road being extremely low even when the doctor's surgery and library traffic are included.
6.1.5 The layout of the residential estate off Francklin Road is multi-branched and the simplistic 150 dwelling threshold takes no account of this. There are very short maximum travel distances to the ends of culs-de-sac in the existing and proposed layout of the estate.
6.1.6 This development proposal will provide sufficient off-street parking for new residents and (see Chapter 7) include a number of mitigation measures, including some revised parking arrangements on Francklin Road, to ensure that this development will not impact upon the amenity and safety of the highway network.

### 6.2 National Planning Policy Framework

6.2.1 This overarching national policy guiding development proposals and their consideration by planning and highway authorities is very clear. At the heart of the document is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This proposal site is well located to take advantage of local facilities used by residents on a day-to-day basis and very good public transport links.
6.2.2 The document is also very clear on how traffic impact should be considered. At paragraph 32 it indicates that;
"Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe."
6.2.3 Even without any mitigation measures the transport impact of this development will be minimal at worst.

### 6.3 Manual for Streets

6.3.1 Manual for Streets (MfS) represents the DfT guidance for good layout and design of residential areas. The guidance indicates the five principal functions of a street to be; place, movement, access, parking, and drainage. For residential streets (see p19) the document indicates that the focus of a residential street is low to medium in terms of 'movement' and low to medium in terms of 'place'.
6.3.2 The implication of the advice is that a few seconds delay to vehicles every now and then is unimportant on such streets.
6.3.3 MfS is not prescriptive in terms of the number of dwellings to be served off a single access.

### 6.4 Other Authorities

6.4.1 There are many authorities that adopt the non-prescriptive MfS approach to the number of dwellings served off a single access. Indeed, even in those authorities where guidelines indicate a prescriptive level of development such as 150 dwellings off a single point of access, there will be many exceptions to that guidance within the authority.
6.4.2 An example of an authority which adopts the approach to residential access design promoted in MfS is Cheshire East Council (CEC). In practice, this has allowed development of 250 dwellings and more off a single access to the wider highway network in this authority.

### 7.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

### 7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 It is clear from the analysis outlined in this report that we do not accept that allowing an additional 25 dwellings off Barker Hill will have any significant impact on the highway network. Indeed, we consider that the additional traffic associated with the proposed development will not have a noticeable impact on the highway network.
7.1.2 In the absence of any severe harm there is no good reason why, in terms of transport impact, the development should not be included within the DPD even without any mitigation proposals.
7.1.3 However, we are mindful of the NCC policy and of the perceived issues of traffic and parking impact that local residents may have and, as a result, have proposed a number of proposals to assist local residents.

### 7.2 Parking

7.2.1 Two or three disabled parking bays could be provided on-street close to the access to the doctor's surgery. This would involve hard paving parts of the existing grass verge to allow passengers to leave the vehicles in comfort. This may also require removal of part of the existing pedestrian guardrail in this location.
7.2.2 This would allow the highway authority to double-yellow line Francklin Road from Main Street as far as the existing council run car park opposite the doctor's surgery to further encourage use of the car park.

### 7.3 Housing Design

7.3.1 The development proposal will add 140 m to the existing highway network. Given that dwellings will be provided with sufficient parking to prevent blockage of this part of the highway network there will be no impact on response times for the fire services. Nevertheless, in order to give further comfort to NCC as highway authority, it is proposed to incorporate sprinkler systems in these new houses.

### 7.4 Sustainable Linkages

7.4.1 Neighbours Lane forms part of FP no. 8. It runs from Main Street in Lowdham uphill to skirt the southern edge of the proposed development site.
7.4.2 The route is currently more suited to use by able-bodied residents although the route was walked on the day of the surveys at the site and seen to be in use by several elderly ramblers. It is intended that the proposal site will provide a link into the footpath making it available for use by residents of the development and other residents of Barker Hill and to offer to surface and light the route to make its use more attractive to residents.

### 8.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

### 8.1 Summary

8.1.1 The traffic and transport impact of a potential additional 25 dwellings off Barker's Hill in Lowdham would be minimal at worst.
8.1.2 The existing residential development served off Francklin Road has a lower than typical residential trip rate, despite the inclusion of the busy doctor's surgery in these calculations. In part, this is explained by the fact that at least 25 of the 150 dwellings served off Francklin Road are sheltered accommodation with lower levels of access to the private car.
8.1.3 The rigid application of NCC guidelines, relating to a maximum of 150 dwellings off a single cul-de-sac system, take no account of this despite their guidance indicating that such considerations should be made on a site-by site basis.
8.1.4 Parking on Francklin Road in the vicinity of the doctor's surgery is primarily related to that usage and despite the provision of ample off-street parking users choose to park on-street. The level of parking on-street is at such a level as to cause delays of only a few seconds to only some of the vehicles using this section of road. No delays are experienced by drivers on the remainder of the route towards the proposed development site.
8.1.5 The Main Street/Francklin Road junction is observed to operate well within its practical capacity at peak times on the highway network. The addition of traffic associated with 25 dwellings will not materially affect the operation of this junction and neither will the addition of such traffic add to the minor levels of delay observed on Francklin Road.
8.1.6 The proposal site is well located to take advantage of local facilities and a very good public transport network.
8.1.7 It is proposed that the development will provide funding to mark out disabled bays on-street at Francklin Road and to provide the necessary hard standing in the verge to enable passengers to leave their vehicles in comfort. This may also include the removal of a certain level of the pedestrian guard railing to allow egress from these vehicles. NCC could take this opportunity to double-yellow line Francklin Road between Main Street and the free to use council car park.
8.1.8 The development will also provide sprinkler systems within the proposed housing to further reduce risk to its residents. Links will be provided to the nearby footpath on Neighbours Lane to allow direct to/from the village centre for residents of Barker's Hill.

### 8.2 Conclusion

8.2.1 The proposed development will not cause severe transport harm. Indeed, several measures proposed will enhance travel for trips to/from the doctor's surgery and also provide a direct route to the village centre.
8.2.2 This development is recommended as suitable, in transport terms, for inclusion in the DPD in accordance with national transport policy relating to developments.

FIGURES


## T12531 <br> Land off Barker Hill, Lowdham

## 2012 Base Traffic Flows (PCUs)

AM Peak Period
(08:00-09:00)


Francklin Road

PM Peak Period
(17:00-18:00)


Francklin Road

## APPENDIX A - PROPOSAL SITE LAND



## APPENDIX B - PARKING BEAT SURVEY


T12531 Land off Barker Hill, Lowdham
Parking Beat Surveys

| Period Beginning | Location |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J | K | L |
| 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 08:00 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 08:15 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 08:30 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 08:45 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 09:00 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 09:15 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 16:00 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 16:15 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 16:30 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 16:45 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 17:00 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 17:15 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 17:30 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 17:45 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 |

[^0]
## TRIP RATE CALCULATION SELECTION PARAMETERS:

| Land Use | $: 03-$ RESIDENTIAL |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Category | : A-HOUSES PRIVATELY OWNED |
| VEHICLES |  |

Selected regions and areas:
04 EAST ANGLIA
CA CAMBRIDGESHIRE 1 days
05 EAST MIDLANDS
LE LEICESTERSHIRE 1 days
06 WEST MIDLANDS
SH SHROPSHIRE 1 days
ST STAFFORDSHIRE 1 days
WO WORCESTERSHIRE 1 days
07 YORKSHIRE \& NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE
NY NORTH YORKSHIRE
2 days
08 NORTH WEST
CH CHESHIRE 1 days
GM GREATER MANCHESTER 1 days
09 NORTH
CB CUMBRIA 1 days
10 WALES
CF CARDIFF 1 days
CP CAERPHILLY 1 days
11 SCOTLAND
EA EAST AYRSHIRE 1 days

## Filtering Stage 2 selection:

| Parameter: | Number of dwellings |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 9 to 48 (units: ) |
| Range Selected by User: | 5 to 50 (units:) |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by:
Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 04$ to $22 / 05 / 12$
Selected survey days:

| Monday | 3 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday | 5 days |
| Wednesday | 2 days |
| Thursday | 2 days |
| Friday | 1 days |

Selected survey types:
Manual count $\quad 13$ days
Directional ATC Count 0 days

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre 1
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 5
Edge of Town 7
Selected Location Sub Categories:
Residential Zone 9
No Sub Category 4

TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/A - HOUSES PRIVATELY OWNED
VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 01:00-02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 02:00-03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 03:00-04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 04:00-05:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 05:00-06:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 06:00-07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.091 | 13 | 24 | 0.217 | 13 | 24 | 0.308 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.151 | 13 | 24 | 0.434 | 13 | 24 | 0.585 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.182 | 13 | 24 | 0.198 | 13 | 24 | 0.380 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.167 | 13 | 24 | 0.157 | 13 | 24 | 0.324 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.179 | 13 | 24 | 0.220 | 13 | 24 | 0.399 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.167 | 13 | 24 | 0.157 | 13 | 24 | 0.324 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.176 | 13 | 24 | 0.170 | 13 | 24 | 0.346 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.198 | 13 | 24 | 0.230 | 13 | 24 | 0.428 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.267 | 13 | 24 | 0.220 | 13 | 24 | 0.487 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.406 | 13 | 24 | 0.230 | 13 | 24 | 0.636 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.456 | 13 | 24 | 0.236 | 13 | 24 | 0.692 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 13 | 24 | 0.239 | 13 | 24 | 0.138 | 13 | 24 | 0.377 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 2.679 |  |  | 2.607 |  |  | 5.286 |

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

```
9-48 (units:)
    01/01/04-22/05/12
    13
0
0
10
```


## APPENDIX D - ACCIDENT DATA

## 35 <br> 13 <br> Total number of pages (including this page) $=$

These details are a record of the personal injury collisions reported to the Police. Every endeavour is made to ensure the accuracy and completeness of these records, which have been transcribed from the original Police Reports. The collision data is then entered and held on computer.
Concise Details Report
Note: Where the age of a person is listed as " $\mathrm{U} / \mathrm{K}$ yrs", this signifies that the age is unknown

## ROAD TRAFFIC INJURY COLLISION RECORDS - DISCLAIMER

No liability can be accepted for errors or omissions.
Crash involved 3 vehicles
60 mph
$\underset{\sigma}{8} \underset{\sim}{\infty}$
$\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$

$$
\overline{s>7.5 t}
$$

sex
Date: 07-November-2012

## Concise Details Report

| No.1 | Police ref: 2B005611 | Road(s) A6097 / A612 | Map ref E467050 N 346040 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Location | A6097 Lowdham Rd Aprx 15M Se Rbt /A612 Nottingham Rd Lowdham |  |  |  | | Severity | SLIGHT | Date 05/01/2011 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | Road Surface Wet $\qquad$

movement
$\mathrm{SE} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$
$\mathrm{SE} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$
$\mathrm{SE} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$
sent, daylight
1st hit
front
back
back
Street lighting
39 yrs


| 21 yrs | Not a pedestrian |
| :--- | :--- |
| 28 yrs | Not a pedester |


| No.2 | Police ref: 2B009307 | Road(s) A6097 / C63 | Map ref E466660 N 346550 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Road Surface Dry $\quad$ Street lighting
Street lighting
Street lights present, daylight
Speed limit
50 mph


veh hit
$\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{*}$

| dir |
| :--- |
| $\mathrm{SE} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$ |
| $\mathrm{SE} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$ |
| $N W \rightarrow$ SE |

$\mathrm{NW} \rightarrow \mathrm{SE}$
age $\quad$ pedestrian direction

| 26 yrs | Not a pedestrian |
| :--- | :--- |
| 44 yrs | Not a pedestrian |

U/K yrs $\quad$ Not a pedestrian

| sex |
| :---: |
| male |
| female |
| male |

male
Casualty details Crash resulted in 4 casualties
Vehicle details vehicle type

$$
\text { cat } \quad 75+
$$

goods > 7.5t
waiting to go ahead but held up
waiting to go ahead but held up
male
female
male

> | SLIGHT | fema |
| :--- | ---: |
| SLIGHT | ma |

Location A6097/Ton Ln Lowdham

Crash resulted in 3 casualties
severity
毕
SLIGHT
passenger
ehicle detail
vehicle type
水
Casualty details
Veh number
in veh 2
in veh 3
Date: 07-November-2012 Time: 10:59


| No. 4 | Police ref: 2B035411 |  | Road(s) A6097 / |  |  | Map ref E 466362 |  | N 347251 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location A6097 Epperstone By-Pass adj to Old Vicarage/Long Acre Farm, Lowdham |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Severity | SLIGHT | Date$12 / 02 / 2011$  <br>  Sat $\mathbf{1 9 : 1 3}$ |  |  | Road Surface Dry <br> Weather Fine |  |  | Street lighting <br> Street lights present and lit, darkness |  |  |  | Speed limit 50mph |
| Vehicle details Crash involved 2 vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicle | type |  |  | movement |  |  |  | dir | 1st hit | veh hit | sex | age |
| 1 | car |  |  | going ahead other |  |  |  | $\mathrm{SE} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$ | front | 2 | male | 63 yrs |
| 2 | car |  |  | parked |  |  |  | $\mathrm{P} \rightarrow$ | back | 1 | male | 45 yrs |
| Casualty details Crash resulted in 1 casualty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veh number | class |  | severity | sex | age | pedestrian direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| in veh 1 | driver/rider |  | SLIGHT | male | 63 yrs | Not a pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Concise Details Report

Date: 07-November-2012



Date: 07-November-2012 $\square$ $\square$
Speed limit
30mph

Date: 07-November-2012



| No. 14 | Police ref: 2B172312 |  | Road(s) A6097 / C63 |  |  |  | Map ref E 466662 N 346540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | A6097 EPPERSTONE BY-PASS NBD, at its Junction with C63 TON LN LOWDHAM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Severity | SLIGHT | Date 20/08/2012 <br> Mon 11:15 <br>   |  |  | Road Surface Wet <br> Weather Fine |  |  |  | Street lighting <br> Street lights present, daylight |  |  |  | Speed limit 50mph |
| Vehicle details Crash involved 3 vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicle | type |  |  | movement |  |  |  |  | dir | 1st hit | veh hit | sex | age |
| 1 | goods > 7.5t |  |  | going ahead right hand bend |  |  |  |  | SE $\rightarrow$ NW | front | 2 | male | 69 yrs |
| 2 | van/goods < 3.5t |  |  | waiting to go ahead but held up |  |  |  |  | SE $\rightarrow$ NW | back | 1 | male | 50 yrs |
| 3 | van/goods < 3.5t |  |  | waiting to go ahead but held up |  |  |  |  | SE $\rightarrow$ NW | back | 2 | male | 24 yrs |
| Casualty details Crash resulted in 2 casualties |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veh number |  | class | severity s |  | sex | age | pedestrian direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| in veh 2 |  | driver/rider | SLIGHT |  | male | 50 yrs | Not a pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| in veh 3 |  | driver/rider | SLIGHT ma |  | male | 24 yrs | Not a pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Date: 07-November-2012


Date: 07-November-2012

## Concise Details Report

 Time: 10:59



## Concise Details Report

Date: 07-November-2012

| No. 21 | Police ref: 2B293210 |  |  | Road(s) A6097 / C119 |  |  |  | Map ref E 467310 N 345700 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | A6097 Lowdham Rd/Gunthorpe Rd Lowdham |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Severity | SLIGHT |  | Date $\begin{array}{c}\text { 08/08/2010 } \\ \text { Sun } \\ \text { 12:40 }\end{array}$ |  |  | Road Surface Dry Weather Fine |  |  |  |  | Street lighting <br> Street lights present, daylight |  |  |  | Speed limit 60 mph |
| Vehicle details Crash involved 2 vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicle | type |  |  |  | movement |  |  |  |  |  | dir | 1st hit | veh hit | sex | age |
| 1 | car |  |  |  | turning right |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{N} \rightarrow \mathrm{NW}$ | offside | 2 | male | 22 yrs |
| 2 | pedal cycle |  |  |  | going ahead other |  |  |  |  |  | NW $\rightarrow$ SE | front | 1 | male | 42 yrs |
| Casualty details Crash resulted in 1 casualty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veh number |  | class |  | severity |  | age |  | pedestrian direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| in veh 2 |  | driver/rider |  | SLIGHT | male |  | 42 yrs | Not a pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Date: 07-November-2012 Time: 10:59



| No. 26 | Police ref: 2B366008 |  | Road(s) A6097 / C119 |  |  | Map ref E466560 N 347060 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | A6097 Epperstone By-Pass /Epperstone Rd Lowdham |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Severity | SLIGHT | Date $30 / 12 / 2008$ <br> Tue 21:28  |  |  | Road Surface Ice Weather Fine |  |  | Street lighting <br> No street lighting, darkness |  |  |  | Speed limit 50mph |
| Vehicle details Crash involved 1 vehicle |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicle | type |  |  | movement |  |  |  | dir | 1st hit | veh hit | sex | age |
| 1 | car |  |  | going ahead other |  |  |  | NW $\rightarrow$ SE | front | 0 | male | 25 yrs |
| Casualty details Crash resulted in 1 casualty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veh number |  | class | severity | sex | age | pedestrian direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | driver/rider | SLIGHT | male 25 yrs |  | Not a pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |

25 yrs Not a pedestrian
Date: 07-November-2012 Time: 10:59



47 yrs Not a pedestrian

## Concise Details Report

Date: 07-November-2012



| No. 32 | Police ref: 4B197009 |  | Road(s) A612 / A6097 |  |  | Map ref E 467040 N 346080 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | A612 Nottingham Rd/A6097 Lowdham Rd Nwbd Apch Rbt Lowdham |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Severity | SERIOUS | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Date } \begin{array}{l} \text { 09/08/2009 } \\ \text { Sun 08:40 } \end{array} \end{array}$ |  |  | Road Surface Dry Weather Fine |  |  | Street lighting <br> Street lights present, daylight |  |  |  | Speed limit 40mph |
| Vehicle details Crash involved 2 vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vehicle | type |  |  | movement |  |  |  | dir | 1st hit | veh hit | sex | age |
| 1 | car |  |  | starting |  |  |  | SE $\rightarrow$ NW | front | 2 | male | 89 yrs |
| 2 | pedal cycle |  |  | going ahead other |  |  |  | NE $\rightarrow$ SW | nearside | 1 | male | 42 yrs |
| Casualty details Crash resulted in 1 casualty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Veh number |  | class | severity |  | age | pedestrian direction |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | driver/rider | SERIOUS | male | 42 yrs | Not a pedestrian |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Date: 07-November-2012 Time: 10:59





[^0]:    APPENDIX C - TRICS RESIDENTIAL OUTPUT

