

From:Inglis, Derek

Sent:16 May 2019 18:08:15 +0100

To:Miller, Craig

Cc:Grigor, Paul;Johnstone, Graeme

Subject:17/00606/PPP Land East of 10 Kittlegairy Avenue, Peebles - Updated TA

Attachments:26286 - Cover Letter to SBC Planning - Updated TA & Ecological Update 17....pdf, 14064 Kingsmeadow Road, Peebles, Transport Assessment 16.04.19-signed_Pa....pdf, 14064 Kingsmeadow Road, Peebles, Transport Assessment 16.04.19-signed_Pa....pdf

Craig

In respect of the updated Transport Assessment for the Kingsmeadows Road proposal (Document Ref: 04 April 2019) I would observe as below:

In 2.11 the TA refers to the SCOTS parking standards. I presume this reference to be to the National Roads Development Guide. Parking standards should be as per the Transportation Standards in the 2016 LDP which is slightly different to the SCOTS standards.

In 5.35, The TA confirms it will review traffic on Tweed Bridge on the basis of a two-way capacity flow of 1500 vehicles per hour. This is from TA 79/99 on Traffic Capacity of Urban Roads. Transport Consultants acting for SBC have calculated two-way capacity flow as 1250 using the same manual. While the figure is open to interpretation based on the parameters used in the manual, SBC have accepted the 1250 figure established by our consultants. The most recent traffic count on behalf of SBC for Tweed Bridge was undertaken in November 2018. The am peak hour 5 day average two-way traffic flow was recorded as 1155 while the pm peak was 1103. The am peak occurred between 08:15 and 09:15 while the pm peak occurred between 16:30 and 17:30. It is the Council's opinion that Tweed Bridge has the capacity to serve the allocated development sites in the 2016 LDP, but that the longer term development sites, including the proposed Kingsmeadows Road site, would be reliant on a second river crossing in the town. This is confirmed in the text for the longer term sites in the LDP. It must be noted that the requirement for a second crossing for the longer term development in the town is by no means all about the capacity of Tweed Bridge. Other important considerations are listed below:

- As the town grows, especially on the south side of the river, it is important that good street connectivity is sought and delivered in line with the aspirations of the Scottish Government Policy Statement document 'Designing Streets'. A single street connection across the river is not conducive to this objective. Proper street connectivity allows dispersion of traffic.
- As the town grows it becomes no longer acceptable to rely on a single river crossing for a medium sized town that is reasonably evenly split on both sides of the river. This is especially

so for development on the south side of the river as the main roads in and out of the town are all on the north side of the river. The alternative river crossings are some distance away and rely on 'back roads' unsuitable for high traffic volumes.

- Without a second river crossing further development on the south side of the river over and above those sites allocated in the current LDP will have a significant impact on the B7062 Kingsmeadows Road/A72/High Street Mini-Roundabout. Furthermore, it would mean that northbound and eastbound traffic from development on the south side of the river is fed into the High Street resulting in a significant effect on traffic flow and amenity in the High Street.

In processing recent planning applications for the allocated South Parks and Tweedbridge Court sites, we concluded that if the anticipated traffic associated with these sites is added to the 2018 traffic count figures, the two-way am peak for Tweed Bridge is likely to rise to 1231 vehicles while the pm peak is likely to rise to 1176. Although the Tweedbridge Court application was refused by the planning committee it will either be successful in appeal or will be back on the table in a different guise. Although these figures do not take the bridge over capacity, they come close to it and other development in line with the LDP will push the figures even closer. This demonstrates that the decision not to support the longer term development sites without a second river crossing is the right one.

In 5.39, the TA confirms the 2018 SBC commissioned am and pm peak hour flows for Tweed Bridge as 1131 and 1085 respectively. These were the figures for 8:00 to 9:00 and 16:00 to 17:00. When broken down into 15 minute intervals the actual am and pm peaks were 1155 and 1103 as described earlier and occurred between 08:15 and 09:15 in the morning and between 16:30 and 17:30 in the afternoon.

In 5.44 in the TA, considers scenarios where development traffic, including the proposed Kingsmeadows Road site, could take the am and pm peak traffic flows for Tweed Bridge up to 1327 and 1263 vehicles respectively and this is based on their slightly lower 2018 peak hour figures for existing traffic. These figures don't appear to make any allowance for the Tweedbridge Court Development. Clearly these figures exceed the 1250 capacity figure.

In 5.57 & 5.58 the TA looks at a scenario for a committed development outcome and concludes that the B7062 Kingsmeadows Road/A72/High Street Mini-Roundabout could have a maximum RFC (ratio of flow to capacity) of 88% which is just over the practical capacity of 85%, but within operational capacity of 100%. When the Kingsmeadows Road proposed development traffic is added (5.59 in the TA) the maximum RFC increases to 97% which is in excess of practical capacity and just under operational capacity. Again, this appears to be without an allowance for the Tweedbridge Court development.

In conclusion, all matters considered, I remain unable to support this proposed Kingsmeadows Road site (longer term LDP site) for development without a suitable mechanism in place for delivery of a second river crossing at an appropriate timing.

Derek

Derek Inglis IEng MICE

Lead Roads Planning Officer

Planning & Related Services

Scottish Borders Council

Tel: 01835 826639

Email: dinglis@scotborders.gov.uk

[Web](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Flickr](#) | [YouTube](#)

How are you playing [#yourpart](#) to help us keep the Borders thriving?