

Topic 1 – Highways and Wider Connections

Policy extract BE2

2. Transport

- a) Provide a link road through the site linking to the Cores End Road roundabout and Ferry Lane;
- b) Provide a redirected bus service and enhanced provision through the site;
- c) Provide contributions to off-site highway improvements as required by the Highway Authority;
- d) Provide and enhance footpath and cycle links to the village centre

Justification text extract

It is important that development of this scale is well served by public transport. There is scope, particularly with the link road, to divert existing bus services through the site to serve the development. The road is to be designed to accommodate buses, to provide future flexibility.

Development brief objectives extract

OBJECTIVE 5: To identify the design and layout requirements for a comprehensive movement network

Action Points:

- 5.1 To provide a vehicular route linking Cores End Road roundabout to Hedsor Road/Ferry Lane
- 5.2 To identify to what extent should Millboard Road and Princes Road provide vehicular/pedestrian/cycle access
- 5.3 To identify the movement network route which responds to place making and the landscape led approach
- 5.4 To identify a bus route through the site
- 5.5 To identify the design requirements for bus stops (i.e. beside the carriageway or within lay bys)
- 5.6 To identify enhanced footpath and cycle links within the site and wider links to the village centre/train station and Orchard

Issues and Responses Log 27.02.20

2. Transport / Connectivity – policy extract

- a) Provide a link road through the site linking to the Cores End Road roundabout and Ferry Lane;
- b) Provide a redirected bus service and enhanced provision through the site;
- c) Provide contributions to off-site highway improvements as required by the Highway Authority;
- d) Provide and enhance footpath and cycle links to the village centre.

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
2.1	<p>What should be the scope of the development brief in terms of detailed transport requirements for onsite?</p> <p>Factors to consider - What type of road do we want the link road to be? What should be the design speed?</p>	Dev./All	<p>The aims should be to ensure safe low speeds through the development to ensure uninterrupted two-way traffic flow and safe access.</p> <p>Would like to identify off-site improvements, including what junction improvements.</p>	<p>Development brief should identify the preferred location of the link road.</p> <p>The link road should be residential in nature. The Wycombe Local Plan Sites Traffic Modelling (June 2017, Jacobs) modelled the road at 30mph and tested a length of 1.3km. This allows for some bends in the layout, rather than 1 continuous straight road. Residential properties should front the road.</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
				Specific details for junction improvements will be dealt with through the planning application process via the Transport Assessment.
2.2	Access from Princes Road is too narrow for a two way bus route.	PC	<p>Access needs to provide proper two-way movement. Properties should be compulsory purchased to provide proper and safe access.</p> <p>We strongly feel that the first preference is to make the road wide enough for two buses to pass each other and of course other public vehicles e.g refuse trucks and HGVs. A one way bus service would be highly inconvenient for residents.</p> <p>If there is sufficient space for 6.5m carriageway then this must be the preferred option and perhaps have a footpath on one side of the road only. 6.5 carriageway should be for the entire link road to avoid pinch points.</p> <p>BCC principle should state:</p>	<p><u>BCC response</u></p> <p>The Local Plan does not mention CPO. It has, however, been pointed out that the arrangement of 2 x 2m footways and a 5.5m carriageway would be unsuitable for two-way bus flow (it is anticipated that a bus route will be taken through the development).</p> <p>BCC Passenger Transport have identified a one-way bus service would be their preference (based upon the routing of the service to be diverted). The bus route should be located through a north south link to maximise fair box revenue but also to minimise delays. This would allow for Princes Road to be 5.5 or 6m wide instead of 6.5m wide.</p> <p>In theory there is space for 6.5 but this would result in a reduction for the footpaths which would not be desirable.</p> <p><u>BCC comments on CPO</u></p> <p>CPO would give more scope for increasing the road width, but Highways Development Management can</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Accommodate two way traffic including buses and goods vehicles.' 	<p>only look at the proposals as they are presented to us but can object if we believe that the development will have a non-mitigatable impact upon highway safety, convenience of use or network capacity. Furthermore, if CPO did come into play, it would be to facilitate development and therefore not a process that the Highway Authority would commission in which be involved.</p> <p><u>BCC suggested wording for development brief:</u></p> <p>The Link Road will need to be designed to be an attractive route linking Cores End Road/Town Lane to Ferry Lane and Cookham Bridge which shall take into account the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate two way traffic • Accommodate the diversion of the bus route • Provide safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle facilities • Limit the number of access points onto the Link Road to reduce delay

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
2.3	How should Cores End roundabout be dealt with in the development brief?	PC	<p>Core End roundabout needs to be realigned/redesigned as it is currently unsafe for cars accessing Princes Road. The Brookbank Green Space should be considered in the roundabout design.</p> <p>The bridge over the Wye at this roundabout is too narrow and moving of the pedestrian walkways to the outer sides of the bridge may be a way to widen the road at this point.</p> <p>The bridge should form part of the re-engineered roundabout to remove the footpaths from the inside of the bridge to make it wider and replace them on the outside of the bridge</p> <p>The current roundabout arrangement is dangerous. If conservation takes priority and the roundabout is not re-engineered then the Development should not be allowed to proceed. A re-</p>	<p><u>BCC suggested wording for development brief:</u></p> <p>Cores End Roundabout will need to be assessed in terms of capacity and safety and appropriately designed in order to accommodate the Link Road and development. This could be in the form of a realigned roundabout that facilitates better entry and exit from Princes Road.</p> <p><u>Other BCC comments:</u></p> <p>There is a large amount of highway verge/open space here to implement a larger roundabout that facilitates better entry/exit from Princes Road. However the grassed verge to the north of the roundabout is a Green Space designation 'Brookbank'. Any development in this area of land will be contrary to DM12, however exceptional circumstances are relevant for a departure from policy.</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			<p>engineered roundabout could be positioned to be further from heritage assets - Cores End Church and Cores End House. See MyMap.</p>	 <p><u>Conservation officer Comments:</u></p> <p>A large engineered roundabout in this location would not be in keeping with the current character and is likely to adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings. Also for placemaking purposes/appropriate design in view of proximity of designated heritage assets.</p>
2.4	How should the road system around the site be dealt with?	PC	<p>Impact of the site should be considered in conjunction with Slate Meadow.</p> <p>Highways should still consider the opportunities to improve the road system and develop their own plan and seek a budget for it otherwise</p>	<p>The County Wide and Local Plan Transport modelling have considered the impacts collectively from all local plan allocation sites including Slate Meadow and Hollands Farm. This concluded the need for a link road through the site. No other mitigation measures are identified in BE2 other than the junction improvement as shown on the policies map.</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			<p>the opportunity is lost and the Villagers will suffer the consequences of the two developments.</p> <p>Access and egress onto Ferry Lane should be considered now.</p>	<p>The full transport modelling reports are available of the Local Plan evidence page.</p>
2.5	How should bus laybys be accommodated? Separate lane or within the road?	PC	<p>Would like off street laybys (to prevent congestion). Parking should be designed to ensure uninterrupted traffic flow. The school, shop and bus laybys should be located together.</p> <p>Restate the need for a 2 way bus service.</p> <p>Lay over requirements to remove existing conflicts around the station. Are welcomed and will need follow up with the bus operators. As currently two buses often layover at the same time at the bus station the bus layby needs to be large enough to accommodate two buses at once.</p>	<p>The development brief should set out the principles for the location of the bus stops. The precise location will be for the planning application to determine.</p> <p><u>BCC suggested wording for development brief:</u></p> <p>The provision of a bus lay-by on the Link Road should be considered to accommodate lay over requirements to remove existing conflicts around the station.</p> <p>Bus stop locations within the development should be considered in relation to land uses within the site and comply with national guidance in terms of walking distances.</p> <p>Clarification needed for BCC is terms of type of preferred layby.</p>
2.6	How should Millboard Road be treated in the development brief?	Dev./WDC	<p>Would like both access points Millboard Road and Princes Road to</p>	<p>The development brief is currently considering 3 link road options (see maps):</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
	Should there be vehicular access? Pedestrian access? Cycle route?		<p>be used for vehicular and pedestrian access.</p> <p>The option of a one-way flow should be considered.</p> <p>Should also consider a roundabout at end Millboard road and improved roundabout at Cores End. Car parking spaces on Millboard Road will be displaced, they should be reprovided for. Millboard Road could be the entry point for the new school.</p> <p>Link Road Options: 1, 2 & 3 do not address the reality that all three access/egress points will carry similar traffic loads.</p> <p>Vehicles travelling from the Wooburn direction on route to the bridge at Cookham will all access the site via the roundabout at Princes Road and exit at upper Hedsor Road and then onto Ferry Lane. Those taking/returning from the opposite direction from the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Princes Road to Hedsor Road (no road from Millboard Road only cycle and footpath routes) 2) Millboard Road to Hedsor Road with Princes Road being a secondary vehicular access. 3) Loop road from Princes Road to Millboard road, with the southern part of the link road being a secondary route <p>See Link Road options table for advantages and disadvantages for each option.</p> <p>Deliverability over Millboard Road as a vehicular access point remains an issue. However, in principle BCC agree this road could be suitable as a primary access/bus route.</p> <p><u>BCC response:</u> The design of the link road would have to be sufficient to protect highway safety but also to facilitate the road as a thoroughfare, as permeability between the A4094 and Ferry Lane was identified as a necessary function through the Jacobs modelling.</p> <p>Car parking</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			<p>bridge heading towards Wooburn and beyond will take the reverse route. Vehicles accessing the site from the direction of Bourne for school or visiting purposes will do so from Millboard Road as will those leaving the site to go towards Bourne End and beyond.</p> <p>All three routes should be of the same size and specification as this will prevent pinch points and congestion.</p> <p>Millboard Road - There is no mention of the junction Millboard Road/Cores End Road which will need redesign and most likely a mini roundabout. The development brief should identify the requirements.</p> <p>Car parking Millboard Road - Experience throughout the County shows Double yellow lines do not work for school drop off without enforcement.</p>	<p>If access is proposed using Millboard Road then the impact of displaced parking will need to be assessed. There are two possibilities in which on-street parking on Millboard Road can be addressed in order to keep it parking-free (once in receipt of parking surveys that demonstrate when it occurs and the likely reasons); one way would be to also adopt the generous verge on the eastern side of Millboard Road (between its junction with Bridgestone Drive and where it meets the development site) and require the developer to install a parking layby. The other option would be to include waiting restrictions (probably double-yellow lines), with the potential of the development including a small car park within the site to deal with the resultant displacement.</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
2.7	<p>What offsite highway improvements will be required? Anymore junction improvements than those 4 required by the policy?</p>	PC/ALL	<p>We feel strongly that specific details for junction improvements should be sorted before planning application and should be both part of Planning Agreements with Highways and with the developer ahead of any planning application.</p> <p>All junctions around the development should be assessed. Queried a one-way system.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to all routes through Bourne End to alleviate bottle necks and traffic backing up due parking and left or right turns off main roads. Main and mini roundabouts should be considered wherever there is a busy junction and potential to cause tailbacks e.g:- The Junction(s) of Furlong Road and Cores End Road, Furlong Road and Station Road, Marlow Road and Blind Lane, Upper Hedsor Road and Ferry Lane.</p>	<p>DM2 - Transport Requirements of New Developments requires several junction improvements. This detail will be for the planning application stage rather than the development brief.</p> <p><u>BCC response:</u></p> <p>This would form part of the junction analyses contained within the Transport Assessment, but anything secured could only occur as a result of mitigation works. Only appropriate forms of junction management will be deployed in reflection of the flows through them occurring as a result of the Hollands Farm development.</p> <p><u>BCC suggested development brief wording:</u></p> <p>The Link Road will provide an alternative route between Core End Road and Hedsor Road. In order to reinforce the desired traffic route, improvements to Furlong should be considered to reduce vehicle speeds/journey times.</p> <p>The following junctions will need to be assessed in terms of capacity and safety and where appropriate mitigation identified in order to accommodate the Link Road and development:</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			<p>Parking on the bend in Cores End Road just past the Catholic Church should be removed. Risk and bottleneck.</p> <p>Millboard Road/Cores End Road needs to be included under list of junctions to be assessed for capacity. There needs to be proactive action with respect to the owners of the Millboard Industrial Site.</p> <p>Furlong Road/ Cores End Road - This junction bifurcates and has a left turn to Bourne End which is dangerous as some traffic turns right here despite vision being blocked by the brow of the hill. There is an opportunity to remove the dangerous access towards Bourne End and at the same time take the opportunity to create parking from existing road and some of the green space.</p> <p>Upper Hedsor Road from the site entrance to the Ferry Lane junction</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Furlong Road/Cores End Road II. Furlong Road/Station Road III. Marlow Road/Blind Lane IV. Upper Hedsor Road/Ferry Lane <p>Any others deemed necessary where they feature significant distribution as a result of the implementation of the development.</p> <p>Parking to be reviewed at the following locations as part of the access strategy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Princes Road II. A4094 III. Kiln Lane <p>Any other locations yet to be identified</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			- Many cars park on the verges and on the road side and, with some reengineering of the verges, it may be possible to have formalised parking to accommodate the actual parking need and enable double yellow lines on a section of road that will see continuous traffic from both directions.	
2.8	How to provide a PRow/cycle link to the train station and village centre?	PC	Would like a cycle/footpath provided directly to the train station (through the Millboard Road industrial estate and recreation ground).	<p>The council is supportive for the creation of this link, however there are a number of deliverability issues that make this difficult: Access is through third party land, this requires the wiliness of the landowner, there may also be safety implications. Any route is likely to require a new footbridge over the river Rye, which is costly and the Environment Agency may not support it due to safety implications.</p> <p>The exact location of the footpath link is still to be determined. A lesser constrained route would be through Millboard Road, where there is an existing PRow. This presents an opportunity for a cycle path.</p> <p><u>BCC response:</u> Millboard Industrial Estate is private, as is the southern section of Millboard Road that serves it, any use of it would only be through agreement or land</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
				<p>acquisition, which may or may not occur through the course of time or compilation of the Development Brief.</p> <p><u>BCC development brief proposed wording:</u></p> <p>The development should consider opportunities to improve pedestrian/cycle safety on Cores End Road to encourage sustainable modes of travel to Bourne End and the train station. This could include speed reducing features and footway improvements.</p>
2.9	Should a footpath/cycle route be provided through Bridgestone drive?	Dev./WDC		<p>WDC view – already existing link although not a PRow. Millboard Road likely to be more accessible as Bridgestone Drive located further to the north of the site. Might not be suitable to encourage more pedestrians.</p> <p>View from BCC needed.</p>
2.10	What constraints does the PRow place on the development?	Dev./WDC		<p>The locations of the existing PRow creates a triangulation of block sizes as it crosses through the site from the corner of Millboard Road Employment Area up to Bridgestone Drive. It is likely the footpath will need to have a small diversion to create an 'S' shape, allowing regular block sizes, which is a more efficient use of land. The location of the PRow is</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
				largely dependent on the location of the link road and school and therefore any diversion is still to be determined.
2.11	PRoW designation runs along Millboard Road rather than within the site. There is no access from Millboard Road to the site at the southern end of Millboard Road where the PRoW is designated (see map), although there is an informal gate half way along Millboard Road. How to best secure PRoW links through the employment site?.	WDC		BCC to advise
2.12	What does the development brief need to say about the Hedsor Road junction in terms of layout safety and design?	Ward Member	<p>Should close the end of the road from Hollands Farm access onto Hedsor Road to Ferry Lane (making it a dead end) and create a new roundabout where the new spur joins Ferry Lane would be a safer design and create a more efficient traffic flow.</p> <p>Hedsor Road is rat run to via Cliveden to Slough and joins Ferry Lane at a right angle junction.</p>	<p>BCC response</p> <p>The arrangement, alignment, visibility, etc. was taken into account when the high-level DM comments were supplied to WDC when looking to include Hollands Farm as a Local Plan site. No specific options for this junction have been tabled or discussed.</p> <p>It is doubtful that the development will impact upon this junction in terms of safety or capacity due to the fact that they are providing a link road which provides an alternative route to Cores End, but junction</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
			<p>Traffic is always backed up and there have been several accidents on the bend at the junction because of its layout.</p> <p>Cookham bridge - Walking is a recreational pursuit and walking to Cookham and along the Cookham river to the railways bridge and back through Bourne End should be an option. Cookham Bridge could be made two way if the footpaths were removed from the inside of the bridge and placed on the outside of the bridge. Highways have yet to talk to their colleagues in Berks and this should occur ASAP to discuss what is both desirable and possible.</p>	<p>analysis will form part of the pre-application process either alongside or after the Development Brief has been adopted. Therefore nothing in terms of changes to this junction have yet been ruled out.</p> <p>Hedsor/Road Ferry Lane Junction to be assessed in terms of capacity, safety and placemaking in view of its location within the HR&RC. Where appropriate mitigation identified in order to accommodate the Link Road and development.</p> <p>The Local Plan countywide modelling identified the bridge on Ferry Lane as a key highway constraint.</p> <p>The signals over the bridge need to be assessed in terms of capacity and where appropriate mitigation identified in order to accommodate the Link Road and development. Given the heritage asset nature of the site, it is highly unlikely that improvements to the bridge itself would be a viable option.</p> <p>The developer would be required to submit an analysis of peak hour operation of the shuttle working signals across the bridge, which will demonstrate the current situation and a future year both with and without the impact of the full occupation of the development. From this we will be able to differentiate the vehicular impact of the development</p>

	Issue	Who identified issue	Parish Council View	Council Response + Development Brief Implications (WDC/BCC)
				<p>against what would occur in the future at the bridge if the development were not to exist. In terms of pedestrian access, and given that residents from the development are more likely to walk between the site and the rest of Bourne End to reach local shops and services, there is likely to be no justification for the development to improve non-motorised facilities at the Grade II listed Cookham bridge.</p>

Link Road Options – Advantages and Disadvantages

Please refer to the link road options map (attached separately)

Option 1) Princes Road to Hedsor Road (no road from Millboard Road)

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatest scope to improve travel time through Bourne End (avoids congestion on the A4094/Core End Road and along Furlong Road) – supported by the Local Plan transport model • Provides a north south link through the site • In developer ownership or highway land, therefore no issues with landownership. • Access would fall outside floodzone 2 and 3 • Requires improvements to Core End roundabout (likely to improve its current capacity and safety) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatest impact on the residents of Princes Road (may also displace some on road car parking) • Existing carriage width 5.5m, scope to widen but that would have an adverse impact on the footpaths, this is not advantageous/ recommended by BCC. This limits a 2-way bus route; however, a 1-way bus route is the preferred option from Passenger Transport (BCC) but opposed by the parish council • Route close to listed building

Option 2) Millboard Road to Hedsor Road with Princes Road being a secondary vehicular access.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road already sufficiently wide enough for bus route and footpaths/cycle path. • It would allow for a two-way bus route (although a one way bus route is preferred by BCC but not the parish council). • Would mean less of an impact on the residential properties for Princes Road. • Bus route would be closely located to workers in the local and strategic employment area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third party ownership complicates deliverability. It would require BCC adoption (BCC confirmed this would be straight forward) • Reduced benefits to travel times through Bourne End. If coming from the east, you will still be required to travel through part of Cores End Road. • Approach into the site will be through an employment area rather than residential development which

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points of access provides greater connectivity into Bourne End. • Having 2 access points onto Cores End Road could relieve congestion pressures for the new primary school. 	<p>could be less favourable for new residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to displace car parking on Millboard Road

Option 3) 'Loop road' from Princes Road to Millboard road, with the southern part of the link road being a secondary route

Advantages	Disadvantages
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus route could loop through part of the development and then continue along existing bus route Furlong Road / Station Road • 3 points of access provides greater connectivity into Bourne End. • Having 2 northern access points onto Cores End Road is likely relieve congestion pressures for the new primary school. • Road corridor likely to be lower key and therefore less of an impact on the Hedsor Road and Riversdale Conservation Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlikely to provide benefits in journey times through Bourne End as will still require the main route to be along the A4094 and Furlong Road. This may mean the development is not acceptable (main reasoning identified in Local Plan Examiner Report) If pursued this option would need to be tested the in transport model. • Could end up with increased parking on Millboard Road • Passenger transport not supportive of a loop within the site as it's not as attractive for bus users (likely to extend journey times)

Questions

- 1) Do you agree with the objectives?
- 2) Are there any other pro's or con's for the link road options
- 3) Are there any other link road options?
- 4) DO you agree with the wider link? Are there any other potential links?
- 5) Should there be wider pedestrian links at Heavens Lea?
- 6) Are there any other issues to consider?